

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

---

MARCH, 1853.

---

ART. I. — THE ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

THE Septuagint belongs to that class of monuments, which come down to us among the remnants of the Jewish literature after the conclusion of the Bible. It laid the foundation of that grand structure on which the Hellenistic philosophy was reared. In Alexandria, the new capital of Egypt, — the land in which, far more than two thousand years ago, the elements of Jewish literature were called into existence, — a new religious life began to develop itself, through the means of a translation of those ancient documents. The Alexandrian version of the Old Testament throws also some light over the same period in Palestine, and it affords an accurate view of the religious life among the Jews in Judea, of which the historians and the literature of the Jews give no account.

The Alexandrian version is a work of ancient times. Should it not help us to answer the question, How were the Scriptures understood at an epoch when the Hebrew language was nearly extinct? May we not find, through the same version, the key to some passages in the Hebrew Scriptures, which are now obscure? The assistance of the Septuagint is of importance in the in-

vestigation of the Hebrew text, and in deciding its authenticity, collection, circulation, age, punctuation, and accentuation. And not only in the literature of the Bible, but also in profane literature, the Septuagint maintains a prominent position; as it is the first work which was translated from Hebrew into Greek. The Greeks, although they refer much to their intercourse with foreign nations, never attempted to give a faithful and exact foreign production in their own language. They lacked the opportunity to make themselves acquainted with foreign tongues, and they considered foreigners as barbarians, who were not worthy of their notice. The Septuagint, in many places, is a faithful reproduction of the literal sense of the original Hebrew; and as the original is still in existence, we are thus enabled to retrace the first steps of the art of hermeneutics, and to behold it in its state of infancy.

But great as is the pleasure which the study of the Septuagint affords, we nevertheless enter upon the task of a close investigation of it with much timidity, because it is connected with numerous difficulties. Many questions arise in the mind of the inquirer concerning the age and the source of the Greek version. Can we by any possible means determine the exact time when the translation was made? Has the original translation, that is generally supposed to have been accomplished several centuries before Christ, come down to us, and what changes has it undergone during its long pilgrimage? The pompous accounts of the translation appear extremely fabulous, and the manifest desire of rendering it illustrious because it was made by command of a king, is very suspicious; and the suspicion obtains more force by the contradictory narratives of the circumstances which accompanied the translation. These have the appearance of myths, and not of facts; so that it seems that the ancients were anxious to apologize for the Septuagint, but not to give an exact and faithful account of it. The historians disagree even as to the simple question, whether the whole Bible, or only the Pentateuch, was translated at that given period. It is also said, that even before the translation of the Septuagint other versions of the Pentateuch existed. Were the translations of the Septuagint influenced by the then



existing translations? The previous translation, it is said, was made in the time of the Persian dominion. The Septuagint, consequently, cannot be considered as an original version, because the translators might have made use of a former one. Doubts are also entertained in regard to the ancient belief, that the Greek version was made at a certain ascertained date. We have no warranty at all, that even a single book from the Bible had been completely and independently translated, so that there remained no occasion for corrections from another hand in the succeeding ages. There are many reasons which are sufficiently strong to induce the belief, that the whole version is a compound of fragments of different learned scholars, which fragments were put together so as to make them appear as a whole.

But even if we should admit the truth of the ancient account of the Greek version, that it was actually made for one of the Egyptian kings, we obtain no correct idea of what the reporters of those accounts thought to convey to future generations. The accounts are so vague and uncertain, that they seem to us to convey the idea, that the reporters themselves did not know how the Greek version, commonly called the Septuagint, was accomplished and put together in its existing form.

When we collate the Greek with the original Hebrew text, we are at a loss to discover whether the same original Hebrew text which we possess was the one from which the Greek version was made, on account of the numerous deviations and discrepancies. Should we not, therefore, suppose that the Greek text in its present form has been remodelled by the hand of ignorant men of a much more recent time? The fact of existing deviations and differences between the two texts at least disposes the faithful student to investigate how the Septuagint came down to us, in whose hands it was kept, whether external circumstances exercised an influence upon it, and whether intentional corruption has impaired its previously correct shape. The solution of the question concerning the character of the Septuagint, and what use the historian of religion should make of it, can only be pronounced when the previous questions have been disposed of. This is the task of criticism which we have imposed upon ourselves. The study of the

Septuagint has engaged us for the last ten years, and we are glad of an opportunity to break silence, and to communicate to the world the thoughts which have been long maturing. We should certainly rejoice to see these questions solved by a more skilful pen; but as this has not yet been done, we approach our task with a due sense of our inability, yet with a hope of the reader's indulgence and of his just appreciation of the difficulties we had to surmount or to remove.

The ancient accounts of both Jews and Christians are to the effect, that a certain Ptolemy desired that a Greek translation should be made from the Hebrew sacred writings; but they do not prove definitely which Ptolemy it was. From the accounts given in the Talmud and in some writings of the Christian Fathers, it would appear that Ptolemy Lagos or Soter, the first of the Ptolemean dynasty, was also the originator of the Greek version (about 285 years before the birth of Christ). Aristeas, Philo, and Josephus inform us, that Ptolemy Philadelphus (about 285 to 246 years before Christ) was its originator; and others, again, attempt to prove that the translation was made in the years in which both Lagos and Philadelphus reigned together (287-285).\* Aristeas, a Greek who lived in the court of Ptolemy, gives an account of the translation, — why it was made, by whom it was made, and under what circumstances the translation was accomplished. Demetrius Phalereus, the librarian of the king, desired, so narrates Aristeas, that the king should procure for his library a translation from the Jewish sacred books, that were there only in the Hebrew language, which translation might greatly contribute to the fame of the king and of the library. The king, at this suggestion, despatched an embassy to the then high-priest, Eleazar, who, in compliance with the king's desire, sent two-and-seventy presbyters, six from each tribe, that they should translate the Hebrew sacred books into Greek. The king received the strangers with great rejoicings and public pageantry, feasted them, and inquired of them many things, to which their answers were so correct as to give the king

---

\* Comp. Hody de Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Lib. I. cap. 6, and Lib. II. cap. 2.

the highest gratification. He esteemed and venerated the Hebrew law highly, and ordered that the translation should be made with solemnity and unction. When the translation was accomplished, it was proved to be accurate, and the king showed himself on that occasion very liberal to the translators, and to their countrymen in his dominions.

From this account, which we take from the narrative of Aristeas, it appears that he was anxious to make his narrative pleasant to the reader, to procure for the Greek version, which his king esteemed and venerated, the same veneration among the Greeks, and to make it appear as holy and distinguished as the original itself. It is also not very improbable, that the book ascribed to Aristeas, a certain Greek writer, who lived in the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, is, under a fictitious name, the work of an Alexandrian Jew of a more recent date, whence we might account for the fabulous tenor of the greater part of the narration, as having been written with the intention to deceive for the sake of promoting piety; in other words, the book of Aristeas might have been intended for a pious fraud. But did any actual event take place on which Aristeas, or the real individual who wrote the history of the Alexandrian version, founded the narrative? This question is generally answered by reference to the fact, that a translation was actually made in the time of the Ptolemean dynasty, and this fact is regarded as the foundation on which Aristeas based his narrative; but criticism and controversy on this subject have not decided, whether it was the king who desired to furnish his library with the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, or the anxiety of the Jews in Alexandria to have their sacred books translated into the Greek, which had become their vernacular tongue, nor whether the translation of the whole Old Testament was finished at that given period, or of the Pentateuch alone.\* The hinge on which the controversy turns is the narrative which is ascribed to Aristeas; but the contending parties (except Hody) never attempted to decide the age in which the Septuagint was called into being, from the internal evi-

---

\* Hody, Lib. II. cap. 7.



dences afforded by the Septuagint itself. If we now examine the translation itself, to obtain some light on the subject under consideration, it will appear to us that the translation was originally not made for any one of the Ptolemean dynasty. The Pentateuch even presents striking reasons to make us distrust such a presupposition.

There are many words in the Greek Pentateuch which could not have been left untranslated if the translation had been made for the king, because they are Grecized Hebrew, which was doubtless unintelligible to Ptolemy; as, *γειώρας* for גֵּר, or *a sojourner*; *σάββατα* for שַׁבָּת, or *Sabbath*; *ἑσαββάτισε* for שָׁבַת, or *he rested*; *ἄν* for אֵין, or *a measure*; *πάσχα* for פֶּסַח. Alexandrian Jews only, who made use in their daily conversation of such Hebraisms, could have been gratified with such translations; and the translators, although knowing the exact Greek words for the originals, as they frequently translated the above-mentioned words correctly, left those words untranslated, since they knew for whom they were laboring. In one place גֵּר is translated *προσίλυτος*, and in another one *γειώρας*; שַׁבָּת, *ἀνάπαυσις* and *σάββατα*; שָׁבַת, *ἑσαββάτισε* and *ἀνέπανε*. In the prophetic and historical books the untranslated words are very numerous. They are Grecized Hebrew; which leads to the supposition, that the translators either did not know how to render them into Greek, or that the meaning of the substituted word was generally known among the Alexandrian Jews; but they could by no means have expected that Ptolemy would be familiar with the Jewish peculiarities. There is no doubt that they could have found the proper Greek words for those which they left untranslated, but they were so common and popular that they left them without translation.

The question might be asked, How was it, that the Jews should have needed so soon a translation of their Scriptures from the Hebrew into the Greek tongue, since it was only fifty years from their departure from Palestine, so that the time for acquiring the Greek language, which has no similarity with their own native dialect, was too short, and, moreover, new colonies from Palestine arrived in Alexandria in those fifty years, which colonies doubtless called forth new recollections of the old Jewish habits and language? But this would be no

objection of weight and importance against the opinion that the Septuagint was actually made for the benefit of the Jews; because Jews were settled in Egypt from the time of Alexander the Great. In the time of the first temple the mercantile relations between Palestine and Egypt were extensive, and it is not unlikely that many Jews (the Jews had always entertained desires of living in Egypt) settled there; and the Scriptures make mention of a large emigration from Palestine into Egypt immediately after the destruction of the first temple.\* Those early colonists, it seems, had entirely forgotten their native tongue; they translated, therefore, their Scriptures into Greek, which became vernacular in Egypt, and for which the ancient Egyptian dialect made way, and this translation was distributed also among the newcomers.

More difficult it is to determine whether the whole Scripture was translated, or the Pentateuch alone. It is obvious that the Alexandrian version was not made after a common, premeditated plan, which had been laid down as a guide for all the translators, and that there was no revision after each translator had accomplished his work; but each worked independently, according to his own plan or fancy and habit of thinking. Even the version of the Pentateuch, which has been considered as the most successful among all the books of the Hebrew Scriptures, exhibits by no means any thing like a common, thoughtful design, by which it was accomplished. The translators of the Pentateuch render one and the same word differently in different books, and the general tenor of each book, the peculiarities and turns of the phraseology, are such as to annihilate our belief in a common plan of the Septuagint. But the question might still be put thus: Were all the books of the Hebrew Scriptures translated into Greek at the time when the Pentateuch was translated, by men who accomplished their task independently, and without restric-

---

\* Compare Jeremiah, chap. xlii. and foll.; Isa xix. 18-20. Also, Aristeas, p. 11, Oxford edition. Aristeas says, that Jews fought with Psammetichus against the king of Ethiopia; καὶ πρὸ τούτων ἑτέρων συμμαχέων ἑξαπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Ἀιθίοπων βασιλέα μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμετίχῳ.

tion, by common regulations purposely laid down for the execution of the Greek version? It is true that the historical books, the books of the prophets, and the hagiographic books, are not so well translated as the Pentateuch; but this circumstance might be accounted for by the difference of the subject and the variety of materials. When we examine the Greek version minutely, we become persuaded that the translators had no concrete knowledge of etymology; but they were frequently guided by the mere connection of the words. That the Pentateuch is better translated than the historic and prophetic writings is because these five books were from immemorial times held among the Jews as the most sacred, and as the basis on which all their literature should be founded. The study of these books was general, and the sense of the words commonly understood. The historic and prophetic writings were not so much studied or known, and therefore the translation of these books was made with less care. The Pentateuch, moreover, was either partly or entirely translated into the Syriac before the Greek translation was even thought of,\* and the translators made considerable use of the Syriac version; but they had no aid in translating the other Biblical books.

The historian Josephus, and the Talmud, speak of the translation of the Pentateuch only; but this forms no objection to the general belief, that the whole Old Testament had been translated. The books which were written after the Pentateuch were not so much spread among the people as those of the Pentateuch; and as the time when the version of these books was made was not given in the translation itself, neither at its beginning nor at its end, the people regarded the time of its becoming known as the time of its publication, and considered the Pentateuch alone as the oldest translation. All these testimonials in behalf of the Greek version, however, are only external, and of no exclusive importance; the internal evidences alone can give us the natural key to the solution of the great difficulties concerning the Septuagint. It is generally believed that the Pentateuch was translated at the time of the Ptolemean dy-

---

\* Compare Talmud, Tract Megilah, p. 3, b; and Nedarim, 37, b.



nasty. An ancient writer, however, gives us some account of a translation of the Pentateuch which existed before that of the Septuagint. The Jewish philosopher Aristobulus says: "It is obvious that Plato has followed our laws and studied their contents with great care; for even before Demetrius Phalereus (i. e. before the translation by the seventy presbyters occasioned by Demetrius), a translation was made by others, before the reign of Alexander and the Persians, which translation contained the history of the exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt, and the miracles that happened there, and the subduing of Canaan, and the whole explanation of the Law; so that it is obvious that the philosopher whom I mentioned above took much from it, and also that Pythagoras incorporated many doctrines from our Law with his philosophy. But the whole version of every thing which our laws contained was made under the king designated Philadelphus."\* Although Aristobulus is accused of a pious fraud, in making verses which manifest religious sentiments like those found in the Scriptures, pretending to quote them from the songs of Orpheus, he, however, deserves credit in respect to his account given of a translation which was made before that of the Septuagint. But Aristobulus does not speak of a *Greek* version. He says "a translation was made," but he does not state into what language. We might suppose that it was a version into the Egyptian tongue, as Jews had lived in Egypt from after the destruction of the first temple. He makes also no mention of the "Pentateuch." He speaks only of a "translation and explanation" of various parts of the Jewish laws. He does not mention the book called Leviticus, which forms an essential part of the Pentateuch; and he speaks of the subduing of Canaan, the account of which was taken from the book of Joshua. Aristobulus, it seems, refers to a book which contained narratives from the Jewish history, with explanatory remarks and additions from other parts of the Jewish sacred writings.

But whether Aristobulus stated historical facts we cannot decide now with undoubted certainty, because we know very little of the author or of the time in which

---

\* Eusebius, *Præparatio Evangelica*, Lib. XIII., cap. xii., pp. 663, 664.

he lived. There is, however, no doubt that the account which we have from Aristobulus concerning the translation of some part of the Scriptures is based on an historical fact.

In the court of Ptolemy Philometor there lived a Jew whose name was Aristobulus. Philometor was friendly to the Jews,\* and gave his permission for the dedication to him of a translation of the book of Esther.† Writers after the time of Aristobulus made use of this circumstance, and fabricated dialogues purporting to have been held by Philometor and Aristobulus in a controversy against the Greeks.

The account of a translation that existed before that of the Septuagint is based on an historical fact, which can be asserted, not only by the Targums (ancient Chaldean translations), but by the Septuagint itself, as this translation, it appears, was made up chiefly of independent translations, which had existed a long time before that of the Seventy was published. There are specimens in the Greek version which are of a much remoter date than the whole version. Many passages in the Septuagint, as we have it now, are the remnants of marginal remarks of a previous translation, which are incorporated into our version, and are now considered as an essential part of the Bible itself. The circumstances by which the translation of the Seventy was called forth admitted the embodiment into it of existing translated passages. For it was not science that required a translation of the Hebrew sacred books, but religious sentiment, which manifested itself all the more strongly after the language in which the original was written had died away. It is therefore certain that the translations of the Hebrew sacred writings were not accomplished at once; but that they were completed gradually, in the succession of many years. We, however, do not undertake to prove that the *whole* of the Septuagint consists of a compilation of various passages which had been previously translated. There are some books which manifest skill and accurate knowledge of both Hebrew and Greek, and are of a much more recent date than other parts of the Septuagint. But our pre-

---

\* Josephus, Ant., Lib. XIII., cap. 6; and Contra Apionem, Lib. XI. § 4.

† Compare Usser de Græca, LXX. Interpret.

vious remarks tend to prove, that, as the translation was called forth by religious sentiment, and not by science, the translation was not made of the *whole* sacred writings, but that such passages were left out as seemed to the translators to be mere repetitions; because the translators' intention was not to substitute the Greek for the original Hebrew, but to assist the Hebrew reader with some kind of translation.

Such a version — if it should be thus designated — is not only conformable to the spirit of those times, but there are many indications that the Greek version was originally intended only as an auxiliary book for the use of Alexandrian Jews. Among the books of the Pentateuch, Leviticus and Deuteronomy are more free from additions than the three remaining ones. And why so? Because Leviticus, which contains the collection of laws, and presented more difficulties to a translator than any of the remaining books in the Pentateuch, required a more exact and thorough translation. This was in a measure true of Deuteronomy. The following ages found less occasion for the correction of the Greek text of those two books. But as to the three books, Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, many passages of which had been left untranslated, the readers in the next generations had occasion to add to and to correct the Greek text; hence the deviations and discrepancies are very numerous.

Leviticus and Deuteronomy are most successfully translated, much better than Genesis, Exodus, or Numbers. This we consider as a very strong proof that these two books had been translated when the Hebrew language was better known in Alexandria, and that they were completely translated.

The incompleteness of the Septuagint led Aristobulus to his belief of other existing translations, to which, as it seems to us, Aristeas also alludes, saying: "The books of the law of the Jews are wanted [in the library]; they are written in the Hebrew language and characters, and are badly explained, as is attested by the judgment of scientific men." \*

---

\* Τοῦ νόμου τῶν Ἰουδαίων βίβλια σὺν ἑτέροις ἀπολείπει· τυγχάνει γὰρ Ἑβραικοῖς γράμμασι καὶ φωνῇ λεγόμενα· ἀμελέστερον δὲ καὶ οὐκ ὡς ὑπάρχει σεσήμανται, καθὼς ὑπὸ εἰδύτων προσαναφέρεται.



There are many passages in the Babylonish and Jerusalem Talmuds in which the version made by the Seventy Presbyters is referred to. Some deviations from the Hebrew text are also mentioned, but the Babylonish Talmud considers them as having been dictated by the "Blessed God himself." \* The passage in Tract Megilah (fol. 9) runs thus:—"Our wise men have been allowed to translate the Bible into Greek. Rabbi Jehudah says, it was permitted that the law alone should be translated into Greek, and this on account of an event which once took place. For it is stated that King Ptolemy introduced two-and-seventy presbyters into two-and-seventy cells, not telling them for what purpose, and that he went into each cell separately, saying to each presbyter, 'Translate for me the law of your teacher, Moses.' The Lord put into the heart of each one of them *one* sense, and in fifteen places they varied from the Hebrew. They wrote: 1st. 'God created the beginning'; 2d. 'I will make man in my likeness and similitude'; 3d. 'And he finished his work on the *sixth* day, and rested on the seventh day'; 4th. 'He created man and wife' (not them); 5th. 'I will come down and confound their tongue'; 6th. 'Sarah laughed with *her friends*'; 7th. 'For in their wrath they slew the ox, and in their pleasure they broke the manger'; 8th. 'And Moses took his wife and his son and set them upon *those who carry men*'; 9th. 'And the sojourn of Israel in Egypt and *in other countries* was four hundred and thirty years'; 10th. 'And he sent the elect of the children of Israel'; 11th. 'And to the elect of the children of Israel he stretched not his hand'; 12th. 'I have not taken *one good thing* of them' (instead of 'not one ass'); 13th. 'Which God, thy God, imparted to them, to shine to all nations'; 14th. 'And he went and served other gods, which I have not bidden them to worship'; 15th. 'Of short feet' (instead of 'a hare,' an animal prohibited to the Jews). This they did to avoid the translation of it into Greek, because the name of the wife of Ptolemy had the same signification."

The Talmud, or more properly Rabbi Jehudah, it seems,

---

\* This is a Rabbinic phrase, which is found very frequently in Rabbinic writings, to which we should attach not the least importance. The Rabbis did not think of the inspiration of the Seventy, in the sense of the Church Fathers.

was well acquainted with the ancient affairs of Alexandria; but as he speaks of the two-and-seventy separate cells, we must come to the conclusion that he has taken this information from the fabulous narrative of Aristæas.

The Jerusalem Talmud gives the same account, but enumerates only thirteen deviations from the Hebrew. Both the Jerusalem and the Babylonish Talmuds are mistaken, in stating that the name of the king's *mother* or *wife* had the signification of "hare"; his *father's* name was "Lagos," or hare.

The Talmud, it must be observed, does not account for the deviations it enumerates; it gives no motives for the translators deviating from the text they were translating; nor can there in many places be assigned any plausible reason for a deviation. But this bare fact of the enumeration of the passages attests the truth of the statement; for if it be fiction, the Talmud would have decorated it with motives and glosses, so as to make it appear as if it were truth. At the time the translation was made, there were, doubtless, certain reasons to make such deviations feasible, but these were in the lapse of time forgotten, and only the facts remained in the recollection of Palestine tradition.

The account in the Jerusalem Talmud is to be understood as stating, that the Seventy Presbyters altered some passages, and handed over one copy of the Pentateuch to King Ptolemy. The Jerusalem Talmud speaks of no *translation*. They gave one copy to the king, as a present for his library, in which books from all parts of the then known world were collected. The king had no desire to make himself acquainted with the contents of the law, but he wished to possess the books to furnish his library with them. The alterations were made in the Hebrew copy, in order that mistakes might be avoided, if the king should desire that a translation into Greek should be made from it. They therefore altered the first Hebrew sentence in the Bible, which is בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים, into בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים, because it might have been translated, "Through a beginning (δὲ ἰν' ἀρχῆς) God created."

The Jerusalem Talmud knows nothing of the embassy to the high-priest Eleazar, which Aristæas narrates, nor does it ascribe inspiration to the Seventy. The accounts of the Babylonish Talmud are obviously exaggerated,

and decorated with fictitious events, as is frequently done in other places. The Babylonish Talmud, in this case at least, is no reliable authority.

There is no possibility of reconciling the Hebrew text with the Alexandrian version, if we continue to think of the latter as of a translation which was accomplished for the purpose of making the original Hebrew Bible to the Greek Jews to be of no exclusive use and importance, as it became to the Hellenistic Jews in more modern times, and also to the Greek Christians.

It would be worse than ludicrous to support the opinion of the imbecile writers who mantled their ignorance with an appearance of piety, and advanced the opinion in regard to the Septuagint, that the Holy Ghost by which the prophets were inspired influenced also the Greek translators, and that they were privileged to accomplish what the prophets had omitted, for purposes known only to themselves.\*

The Jewish writer, Rabbi Asaria di Rossi, believes that the primitive Greek translation was a good one, but was afterwards corrupted by the Alexandrian Greeks, who were always hostile to the Jews. This view cannot be supported, because the Septuagint exhibits errors which must be ascribed to the ignorance of the translators themselves; and, moreover, we find that Philo, in his *Treatises*, quotes passages from the Septuagint, which manifest the same errors that are now in our printed Greek Bibles. The corruptions would have emanated from Gentile — not from Christian — Greeks; but what business had Alexandrian Gentile citizens with the Hebrew religious books? How came they to be so well acquainted with the contents of the Jewish sacred writings, as to know which passages were corrupt, and which to leave unaltered?

A second opinion of the same learned Rabbi has much greater probability, and might be acceptable for many other reasons. Rabbi Asaria di Rossi thinks that the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures was made from a Chaldaic version, — not from the Hebrew, — which was made in the time of Ezra, for the sake of explaining the original Hebrew to the people. This Chaldaic version,

---

\* See Augustin de Civitate Dei, Lib. XV. cap. 13.



if we may style it so, was paraphrastic, and adapted to the intellect of the Jews, who, returning from the Babylonish captivity, had forgotten their native tongue, partly at least, and acquired the language of their new masters. But this second opinion of Di Rossi, however probable it may appear, is by no means correct. The deviations from the Hebrew which we meet with in the Septuagint have their source in the translators themselves, and not in another version. They translated from the original Hebrew; but they entertained opinions which prevailed in their time, and these, together with dominant religious sentiments, influenced their method of translating.

Another reason that might induce the belief that the Greek version was made from a translation, and not from the original Hebrew, is, that the Greek version agrees in numerous places with the Samaritan, and not with the Hebrew. The Samaritans are still in possession of a Pentateuch, which in many passages corresponds with the Septuagint, and differs from the Hebrew. Many learned scholars, like Selden, Hottinger, and Eichhorn, therefore, were of the opinion that the Septuagint was made from the Samaritan text. But this does not sufficiently explain all the differences and discrepancies of the Septuagint which are in the prophetic writings; since the Samaritans have nothing in common with the Jewish Scriptures except the Pentateuch alone. The Samaritan text of the Pentateuch, moreover, manifests strikingly that it was originally made from a Chaldaic translation, which was in the hands of the people, teeming with mistakes and errors. This might answer the question, why the Septuagint agrees in many places with the Samaritan, for doubtless the translators were cognizant of the same Chaldaic version from which the Samaritan was made; but it does not solve the numerous other problematic and perplexing questions which arise in reading the Septuagint. We can, then, only understand the Septuagint when we assume that it is a translation from the original Hebrew; and the deviations are accounted for by the particular views, knowledge, and plan the translators embraced and entertained. This is the only and sure stand-point from which criticism can safely set out to make a collation between the Greek text and that one from which we think the Septuagint was rendered.

Doubt and uncertainty have enveloped the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. If we now return to its history, we have no certain guide to find out with accuracy and safety, either the time at which the beginning of the translation was made, or when it was finished; nor do we know in what place, city, or village it was produced. The fabulous narratives of the ancients, and the credulous belief of more modern writers, do not deserve our implicit confidence. An earnest and thorough perusal of the *entire* Septuagint, as we have it now, will suggest many doubts in regard to the common belief, that the place in which the translation of the Bible into Greek was made was Alexandria.

Philo, the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, who, in the course of his philosophic dissertations, quotes numerous passages from Scripture in support of his fanciful, mystical notions, makes no mention of many books which we have now incorporated in the Scriptures. It is strange that he quotes no passages from the book of Ezekiel, from which he might have obtained ample support for his method of allegorizing Scriptural narratives. But this would form no objection to the belief that the book of Ezekiel was translated before the time of Philo, indicating only that the translation might not have been made in Alexandria. It was perhaps made in Cyrene,\* or in some other of the North-African Jewish settlements, and came to Alexandria after the time of Philo. Such was probably the case with the book of Daniel. From time immemorial, a translation of this book from that of Theodotion was used, and not that of the Seventy. The reason why the translation of Theodotion was used, was not known even to Hieronymus, who says in his preface to Daniel: "*Danielem Prophetam juxta septuaginta interpretes D. S. Ecclesiæ non legunt, utentes Theodotionis editione: et hoc cur acciderit nescio.*" But the book of Daniel might also have been translated in another place than Alexandria, and the translation may have become known after that of Theodotion was spread in Egypt; and when the Church collected the Scriptural books into one canon, the collectors may have incorporated Theodotion's translation of the book of Daniel.

---

\* See Wesseling de *Judæorum Archontibus*.

Alexandria, therefore, is by no means proved to have been the place where the whole Septuagint was made. There is no doubt that Hellenistic Jews translated the Hebrew Scriptures, and that the want of such a translation was first felt in Alexandria, whence the impulse proceeded, and in which was then the earliest and most esteemed Jewish settlement. In this city the Jews began first to translate from Hebrew into Greek; but the whole Greek version of the Bible was by no means accomplished there. It would be an over-hasty judgment, if we should maintain the opinion that the Pentateuch, in its complete form, was translated in Alexandria. The question naturally suggests itself, whether there was no translation of the Bible made in any other place. The development of the Jewish spirit was not limited to Alexandria alone. The Palestine Jews, who departed from the line of interpretation according to the sense of the word, and invented that of the Agadah, have interpreted or paraphrased the Scriptures in various places; and we are justified in supposing that the Hellenistic Jews were not inferior or less zealous than their coreligionists in Palestine. Two ways suggest themselves for solving the problematic question in relation to the completion of the Septuagint. We must first ascertain when each separate book was translated and introduced into the Jewish communities as a finished book; and, secondly, when the whole Septuagint was concluded, and considered as a finished translation of the Hebrew Bible, among the Jewish communities at large. In respect to the latter question, we must simply affirm, in accordance with our previous argument, that the synagogue in Alexandria never knew of a *canon* of the *whole* Scriptures. But the Pentateuch even, it seems, was not generally considered as a *canon*.

We find also a large number of glosses in the Septuagint version, which are remnants of a previous translation. From the narrative of Aristæas himself, it appears that frequent alterations were made in the translation previous to that of which he is the historian. He says: "This translation was read before the priests, the learned, and the elders, and the desire was manifested by many that it should remain in this form, and that nothing in it should be altered. As this desire found general ap-



probation, he (Demetrius) commanded that the curse (Cherem) should be pronounced over every one who might correct it, add to it, or take from it."\* This fiction of Aristeas, about the reading before the priests, the learned, and the elders, carries with it, at least, the certainty that the Greek version lacked that sacredness which makes a version unalterable among the people, and that the former translations were frequently altered. It was the desire of Aristeas to procure for the Alexandrian version absolute authority among the Jews in Alexandria; he therefore tells them, that it was made from a Palestine copy, and by Palestine Jews, and decorates his narrative with fictitious events, to persuade, if not to delude, the people to believe in his statements. He endeavors to flatter the national pride of the Alexandrian Jews; and the whole narrative is calculated to produce admiration of their own nationality, which should have the consequence of influencing their judgment, and of inducing the belief of the authority of the Greek translation for which he contended.

As long as the knowledge of the Hebrew language was retained in Alexandria, the Septuagint could obtain no authority at all. Aristobulus, for instance, quotes passages from the original Hebrew text (verbally), and not from the Septuagint. He relates that the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek, but does not mention any thing of those pompous events with which Aristeas decorates his narrative.

The Jewish tragedian, Ezekiel, who lived about two centuries before our era, alludes frequently to the Septuagint; but the poet, who was much occupied in accomplishing his task of writing a Biblical drama in the Greek dialect, cherished the Greek version, because it saved him time by its making references to the original Hebrew of no importance.

The Septuagint, however, was in the time of Philo,

---

\* Καθὼς δὲ ἀνεγνώθη τὰ τεύχη στάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ τῶν ἐρμηνέων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. Καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος οἱ τε ἡγούμενοι τοῦ πλήθους, εἶπον. ἐπεὶ καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως διηρμήνεται, καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἡκριβωμένως. Καλῶς ἔχον ἐστὶν, ἵνα διαμένη ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα, καὶ μὴ γένηται μηδεμία διασκευή. πάντων δὲ ἐπιφωνησάντων τοῖς εἰρημένοις, ἐκέλευσε διαρᾶσθαι, καθὼς ἔτος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν. εἴ τις διασκευάσει προστιθεὶς ἢ μεταφύρων τι τὸ σύνολον τῶν γεγραμμένων ἢ ποιούμενος ἀφαίρεσιν.

the Alexandrian philosopher, very much in the same condition as that in which we now possess it. Philo used the Septuagint as if it were the original itself. He comments on single words, not as if they were the words of men, but, of God. He discovers mystical and concealed ideas in words which seem to the common sense superfluous and obscure. He considers the Greek text as the Palestine Jews considered the Hebrew text; and we cannot deny that he seems to have stood in awe of the sacredness of the Septuagint. The original text was entirely unknown to him; and he had not the slightest idea that the Greek text deviates from the Hebrew. He knew not even the elements of the Hebrew language. Is not this fact, that Philo, the learned philosopher, who was so well versed in Greek and Latin literature, and withal was likewise a pious Israelite, did not know the elements of Hebrew, a strong evidence of the entire extinction of the Hebrew language in Alexandria in his time?

This fact might induce the belief, that the Greek Pentateuch, at least, was considered as canonical among the Alexandrian Jews, and was read in the synagogues on Sabbaths and holy days. But how is it that the quotations from the Septuagint, in the works of Philo, differ so very much from the Hebrew text? If the text of the Septuagint which was read in the synagogue was correct, how is it that the verses which are quoted by Philo are so very unlike the Hebrew?

The way of reading the Pentateuch in the synagogues must, therefore, have been very different from what is commonly supposed; and we can ascertain the way of reading in Alexandria, if we inquire what was the method that prevailed in Palestine.

On every Sabbath a certain fixed part — *Parasha* — of the Pentateuch was read in the Palestine synagogue, to which a corresponding passage from the prophetic writings — *Haphtara* — was added. The time when the reading of a part of the Pentateuch was introduced is mentioned as very ancient by the Jews, by the Apostles, by Josephus, and in the Talmud. The time when the reading of the corresponding passages from the Prophets was introduced is not known. It is thought that the reading of the Prophets was introduced in the time of the Maccabees. Antiochus Epiphanes prohibited the

Jews from reading in the Pentateuch. They, therefore, substituted for the Parashas the Haphtaras; or, as the satellites of Antiochus seized and destroyed every copy of the Pentateuch which they found in the synagogues, the Jews introduced the reading of prophetic passages instead of the Parashas from the Law. These prophetic passages were retained and sanctioned in the time of the glorious victories of the Maccabees. But it appears to us, that these motives for the reading of the Haphtaras have no foundation at all. Antiochus himself could make no distinction between Law and Prophets, and he was probably alike hostile to both; and the satellites and soldiers, who were commissioned to search the Jewish synagogues and houses for their books, doubtless made no investigation to ascertain whether they were the books of Moses or of Isaiah and Jeremiah. They destroyed every book they obtained, without much inquiry as to its contents. These motives lack also all historical foundation, as neither the Mishna nor the Talmud mentions the introduction of the reading from the Prophets into the synagogue as caused by the tyranny of Epiphanes. If we now examine the facts relating to the reading from the Prophets, we discover no regulations in the rituals of the synagogue concerning them. For four Sabbaths only, and for four festivals, passages were ritually fixed.\* But even these regulations are of more modern date, and are disputed in the Talmud. How is it, we ask, that there are no ritual regulations for the reading from the Prophets, as for that from the Law? Our reply is, that the reading from the Law was connected with the lectures which were delivered on every Sabbath from time immemorial. These lectures were generally prefaced or introduced by passages from books of the Prophets or from the Hagiographa. The Haphtaras † were the introductions to the lectures. The lecture was a plain explanation of the Parasha which was read in the synagogue, and was introduced by the Haphtara, containing sentiments similar to those just read from the Pentateuch. But as the passages contained also sentiments which were not like those from the Law, the lec-

---

\* Megilla, fol. 30, 31.

† Haphtaras, from the Hebrew stem פתח, to open.



turer had free scope to develop his wisdom and skill in the art of exegesis and interpretation. The lecturer then added more passages from the Prophets, according to his own will, without restriction or ritual regulation. This was the beginning of the reading from the Prophets, which became in the course of time a fixed custom; and those passages, having been once defined, were read in the synagogues and observed as strictly as the reading of the Law itself. In spite of this fact, however, the passages were liable to alteration, and the regulation was not always closely followed. The Haphtara, consequently, was in Palestine considered as arranged for the lecturers, and in a similar way was also the reading of the Pentateuch in Alexandria. Passages were selected from the Pentateuch for a lecture on every Sabbath; but the reading of Parashas from the Pentateuch, as it was customary with the Palestine Jews, was not known in Alexandria at all. Philo is our safe guide. He says: "The schools, where wisdom, temperance, fortitude, justice, and other virtues are taught, are opened on the Sabbath day. Here many sit deeply silent and listen with close attention, thirsting after the precious teachings. One of the most learned now rises and lectures on that which is most wholesome and useful, leading man to that which is best for him. These inexhaustible words and doctrines are divided into two parts. The one is in relation to God, concerning piety and holiness, the second in relation to man, concerning philanthropy and justice."\* It is evident that he does not speak of *reading* from the Pentateuch, but of *lecturing* on it. A comparison with another passage from Philo's writings will leave no doubt that he speaks in the quoted passage of lectures. "In every district of Egypt," Philo says, "reside many Therapeutes, especially in Alexandria. On each Sabbath day they come together to converse with each other. The oldest and the most learned one, who

---

\* Ἀναπέπταται γοῦν ταῖς ἐβδομαῖς μύρια κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ διακοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἐν οἷς οἱ μὲν ἐν κόσμῳ καθέζονται, σὺν ἡσυχίᾳ τὰ ὄντα ἀνωρθηκότες μετὰ προσοχῆς παύσης, ἕνεκα τοῦ διψῆν λόγων ποτίμων. Ἀναστάς δέ τις τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων ὑφηγείται τᾶριστα καὶ συνοίσαντα, οἷς ἅπας ὁ βίος ἐπιδώσει πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον, τό τε πρὸς θεὸν δι' εὐσέβειας καὶ ὁσιότητος, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους διὰ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ διακοσύνης.

possesses the largest amount of knowledge in the laws, rises and delivers a lecture." \* Speaking of the Essenes, Philo says: "Palestine and Syria are also not devoid of that high virtue (as it is found among the Gymnosophists in India). A great part of that country is inhabited by Jews, among whom are about four thousand of the Essenes. They study the laws of the fathers at all times, but particularly so on the Sabbath days. The Sabbath is with them a holy day, and they do in it no other work. They come together in holy places, called synagogues; there they sit according to their respective ages, the youths after the aged, listening attentively. One reads the Scriptures, and another of the most learned explains the difficult passages." †

In this passage there is distinctly mentioned the *reading* of the Scriptures as a peculiar custom of the Essenes in Palestine. He is very particular in mentioning the name of the meeting-places, *synagogues* as they were called in Palestine. In Alexandria and in Rome, Philo styles the places of worship *proseuches*. Philo, it seems, obtained his information of the Essenes on his journey to Palestine; he knew full well the Palestine custom of *reading* the Scriptures in the synagogues, and yet he never mentions the reading when speaking of the Alexandrian houses of prayer, not even among the Therapeutae, who resembled the Essenes in many respects. Philo's strange ignorance of the Hebrew tongue and the corruption of the Septuagint can now be sufficiently explained. A single passage, as a text for a lecture only, was chosen and read in the house of prayer; the Scrip-

---

\* Πλεονάζει δὲ (scilicet τὸ γένος τῶν θεραπευτῶν) ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καθ' ἑκα-  
στον τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων νομῶν καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. ταῖς  
δὲ ἐβδόμαις συνέρχονται καθάπερ εἰς κοινὸν σύλλογον. παρελθὼν δὲ  
ὁ πρεσβύτερος καὶ τῶν δογμάτων ἐμπειρότατος διαλέγεται.

† "Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία καλοκαγαθίας οὐκ ἄμοιρος, ἣν  
πολυανθρωποτάτου γένους τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγη μοῖρα νέμεται. λέγον-  
ταί τινες παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Ἑσσαιῶι, πλήθος ὑπὲρ τετρακισχιλίου. τού-  
τους (scilicet πατρίους νόμους) ἀναδιδάσκοντες μὲν καὶ παρὰ τὸν ἄλλον  
χρόνον, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐβδόμαις μάλιστα διαφερόντως. ἱερὰ γὰρ ἡ ἐβδόμη  
νενόμεσται, καθ' ἣν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπέχονται ἔργων. εἰς ἱεροὺς ἀφικνούμενοι  
τόπους, οἱ καλοῦνται συναγωγαί, καθ' ἡλικίας ἐν τάξεσιν ὑπὸ πρεσβυτέροις  
νέοι καθέζονται, μετὰ κόσμου τοῦ προσήκοντος ἔχοντες ἀκροατικῶς, εἴθ'  
ὁ μὲν τὰς βίβλους ἀναγινώσκει λαβὼν, ἕτερος δὲ τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων  
ὅσα μὴ γνῶριμα παρελθὼν ἀναγινώσκει.

ture was not ritually divided into Parashas, to be read on every Sabbath by the appointed section. The lecture was delivered in the Greek language; and if we should even assume that the text was read in the Hebrew, we could by no means be justified in supposing that the Alexandrian Jews understood it, as it was also translated into the Greek. There was also, from the same cause, not much care employed to guard the version against discrepancies, because the texts which were taken from it formed only insignificant parts.

The Septuagint, although spread abroad among the Jews in Asia Minor, was never considered as canonical. It served only as an interpretation of the Hebrew text. The quotations in the New Testament, which are often at discord and variance with the Septuagint, prove that the Jews never possessed any fixed canon of the Greek version. The testimony of the Church Fathers, that the Greek version was found in the Jewish synagogues, does not at the same time demonstrate that the Greek version was *read* in the synagogue in accordance with a ritually established regulation. Justin Martyr complains of the Jews having corrupted the Septuagint in three places; but if this accusation be true, it tends only to prove that the Jews considered the Septuagint as a profane book, and did not attach to it any canonical sacredness. If the Jews had been aware that there was in existence a revised, canonical Greek version, which was generally acknowledged and accepted, they would not have ventured on the corruption of which Justin accuses them. The revised canon would have detected their flagrant falsehoods; but there was never a standard copy, which was esteemed canonical, and so every transcriber was at liberty to write what he thought proper, for the sake either of correction or of corruption.

T. R.

---



## ART. II. — ANSCHAR, THE APOSTLE OF THE NORTH.\*

It was towards the middle of the ninth century — just a thousand years ago — that the Apostle of the North went on his perilous mission among our Northern ancestors; and the aggressive faith of Christendom encountered the grim superstitions of Scandinavia. The realm of Charlemagne was as yet undivided, though his son Louis held the great Emperor's declining sceptre with a less vigorous grasp. The germs were secretly growing, of the changes which presently became visible enough on the political map of Europe: jealousies among the sons of Louis, which led to the violent partition of the empire, at the disastrous battle of Fontenoi; missionary enterprises, which before the end of this century had brought the rude nations of Scandinavia and Muscovy within the pale of a nominal Christianity; steady aggressions of Church power (helped on by the forged decretals of Isidore), which fortified the See of Rome in its newly gotten temporal dominion; intellectual discussion, fostered under the intelligent rule of Charlemagne, which brought on the violent controversies respecting transubstantiation and predestination; the ecclesiastical tastes and policy of the pious Emperor, which prepared France to become a theocratic republic in the days of Hinkmar, and to oppose so vigorous a resistance to the encroachments of the Papacy; commercial enterprises, undertaken by the sea-faring people of the North, which spread the treasures of Byzantium to the remotest West, while they made the entering-wedge for Christianity to penetrate the dark mass of pagan barbarism; and the expeditions of the Baltic pirates, which kept the European coasts in constant terror, and drove men, for their last defence, upon the harsh *régime* of Feudalism.

The ninth century is further interesting to us, since it brought about the first firm organization of the British people, under the Saxon Alfred. And while England fortified itself, under him, as an independent power, Ireland, less exposed to the storms that swept the continent,

---

\* *Anschar: a Story of the North.* By RICHARD JOHN KING. London: J. W. Parker. 1850. pp. 390.

was already "the isle of the saints," and one of the chief seats of Christian learning. Saint Patrick had brought the Gospel thither four centuries before, and Columba, at the close of the sixth century, had carried out his vigorous reform of the monastic system over half of Europe. Eminent before all others for scholarship and philosophy were Alcuin, at the court of Charlemagne, and John "the Scot" (called "Erigena," or Son of Erin), the philosophical champion of Hinkmar, and opponent of the morbid dogmatism of Gottschalk.

And so this period of dissolution, feebleness, and barren contention, as it might seem at first, proves to be one of no common interest and importance. The short-lived empire of Charlemagne had served its purpose of establishing a sort of confederacy of nations in Western Europe. It furnished, as it were, a narrow isthmus between the waters in which were dissolving great drifts and fragments of the ancient civilization, and those out of which new continents were forming. After passing it, we are fairly embarked upon the course of modern history. The populations which come before our notice, and the historical causes at work, are those which are vital even now.

A few words more, in exposition of these causes and results, may not be unfit as an introduction to the story whose title is the name of the most eminent Christian champion of the ninth century. The mission of Anshar into Sweden was one of the fruits of the peaceful and religious policy of Louis. Along with the conquests of his father, (those pitiless conquests in which, it was said, all were cut off who were "taller than the Emperor's sword,") a sort of nominal Christianity had been carried into the Saxon forests, and a mongrel faith had driven back the ancient worship of Odin and Thor. Such as it was, however, and in spite of formidable recoils of the old superstition from time to time, it seems to have pledged these regions to an alliance with the Christian monarchy of the West. Loyalty to their faith was like loyalty to their flag; and, with whatever misgiving and reluctance, the rude Saxon stood stanchly by that mightier Power which had foiled his fathers' gods. The great peril to these wavering conquests of the Church militant lay in the barbarous realm beyond. The breach

might be easily healed where it had been suddenly broken; and a horde of Slaves, Danes, or Swedes might find itself in alliance with all the passionate terrors of a lingering paganism.

To prevent this impending peril was the constant object of the Emperor's watchfulness. It was guarded against alike by the relentless policy of Charlemagne, and by the anxious forethought of his humane son. What his father had kept back by the strong arm and sharp sword, Louis sought to neutralize, by invading the grim paganism itself, which created the danger. The hands that were trained in the sleepless service of the Great Emperor, still guarded the boundaries of his dominion; but the spirit that directed them was less hardy and enterprising, and quite incompetent to the sterner task of conquest. Besides, in the fifty-three several campaigns that were forced upon it, the empire had already, in the lifetime of Charles, exhausted its vitality. From being a needful defence of the Christian frontier, it had become "a tyrannic effort at a premature centralization, — a forced partnership in one immense warfare, which caused the reverses of Ostrasia to be felt as far westward as the Loire." As it was in the decay of the Roman state, freemen were drawn away for military service, or absorbed in the increasing class of the miserably poor, while the land was shared more and more in vast estates. Owners of the broad domains became feudal lords of the soil, while vast numbers were falling into the wretched condition of slaves.\* Whole tracts of country were depopulated by the proprietors, whose political economy taught them to prefer the profits of cattle and sheep to the prosperity of the district, or the lives of men. "From the wrath and ravage of the Northmen, good Lord, deliver us!" had come to be a part of the litanies of France. The mighty Charles had wept at his palace window when he saw the pirate fleets that were only kept back for a time by the terror of his name, and knew what great calamities must follow at his death.

---

\* See Sismondi. The grants of Charlemagne included men as well as cattle with the estate; and the convent property which he bestowed on Alcuin was "stocked" with no less than twenty thousand slaves.



To repair these calamities was the sincere and earnest endeavor of his successor. He redressed such wrongs as were within his reach. He loosed the heavy burdens that his father had imposed; and even shed tears when an insurgent cousin perished by the rough handling of his officers. He was himself ruled by some of the better sort of clergy, and in all sincerity undertook a much needed religious reform.\* Those who before were scattered and irresponsible he bound in closer association, under canon laws, and put them under a discipline similar to that of the monks. In fact, the singularly effective organization of the Catholic priesthood is very largely due to the efforts made in this way, about this time.

This reform at home went along with the Emperor's religious policy before spoken of, which was, to neutralize the aggressive force of paganism by the peaceful spread of Christianity. Paschasius Radbert, champion of the new doctrine of transubstantiation, ("the first," says a Roman Catholic historian, "to unfold the genuine sense of the Catholic Church,") was the head of a celebrated school at Corbey, in France. His favorite pupil was the young man Anschar (or Ansgar), who at the time of his first mission among the barbarians was only twenty-four. In the fervid visions of his youth he had beheld the visible glory of the Lord, and had heard himself summoned, by no human voice, to spend his life for the conversion of the heathen, and win the blessed crown

---

\* It shows the growing spiritual pride, that the priests sent out on missions were forbidden to do any servile task. Labor with the hands was prohibited, whether in husbandry or trades. To secure the bishops' influence, the sovereign would bestow on them civil rights and powers. They were made counts and dukes, to set off the rude violence of feudal chiefs. A Bishop of Ratisbon was once in peril of his life in battle; but, says the chronicler, "Taking comfort in the Lord, after a long struggle he overthrew his foe, and with much difficulty got home safe. He was a good soldier among the clergy, and an excellent pastor; and his scar was a mark of honor, and not shame." "Ask of the clergy," says one of the capitularies of Charlemagne, "whether he has renounced the world, who labors every day, no matter by what means, to increase his wealth, sometimes promising the blessedness of heaven, sometimes threatening the eternal doom of hell; or else, in the name of God or of some saint, spoils of his goods some simple and ignorant man, rich or poor, so that his lawful heirs lose them, and the greater part, by reason of the misery into which they fall, are driven into all sorts of disorder and crime, and commit, almost by necessity, assault and robbery."

of martyrdom. A man of firm and intrepid will, he shared the tender and mystical faith of his teacher Radbert; \* yet in him it took a more visionary character, and was tinged always with a vein of sadness; and it was his favorite resource to withdraw from the cares of his active ministry to pious meditations, and acts of penitence or devotion. Conceiving himself summoned and fore-appointed to the great Christian enterprise, he had waited, modestly and humbly, till the evident call of God should come. The monastery of New Corbey was founded on the Elbe, — a station whence the Christian conquests which Boniface had begun were pushed, under Anschar, into the remoter North. A fortress had been established at Hamburg, among the dense forests that made the frontier of paganism; this, and afterwards Bremen, became the seat of Anschar's bishopric. Harold Hlak, an exiled Danish or Jutland chief, had found refuge with the Emperor Louis, adopting the Christian faith; and his return opened the way for a mission among the Danes. The roving traders of Scandinavia had been as far as Micklagard, the "great city" of the East (Constantinople); and there, or along the Mediterranean, or on the English coast, or at the court of Louis, they had found the worship of the white Christ, † whose invisible might had broken the Saxon superstitions, and forced the ancient religion to intrench itself in the strongholds of their wilder mountains and ruder forests. The secret charm of a more peaceful faith, the Catholic ritual, which seemed to them the invocation of another order of spirits, the language and patient fidelity of Christian captives at home, and, still more, the irresistible impression that came from dealing with a more skilled and cultured race, all prepared them to seek and welcome the new religion. It was at their request, and under the convoy of a trading fleet, that Anschar went on his first mission to the far North, — that mission whose issue is detailed in the narrative portion of the book before us.

---

\* The strongest expressions of Radbert in behalf of the "real presence" may easily be rendered into warm and highly colored religious rhetoric; and it must be remembered that they preceded, not followed, the controversy that gave shape and sharpness to the dogma. (See Gieseler.)

† So called because those to be baptized were clothed in white. (Pigott's *Manual of Scandinavian Mythology*.)

These details are mostly inventions of the author. Respecting the real events of the Swedish mission, the history is brief and meagre. They are known only through the personal narrative of the life of Anschar, written by his companion and successor, Rembert. We know not much more, than that the mission was favored by a powerful and intelligent party among the Swedes; that it was partly foiled by an attack of pirates, who seized most of the royal gifts and holy vessels on the way; that it met the fierce hostility of that old paganism, which stood savagely at bay in this its last fortress; that the life of Anschar was wandering and hazardous, the church and bishopric at Hamburg being laid waste with fire; and that he died at the age of sixty-four, in sorrow that his Lord had not thought him worthy of the martyr's crown. He was a man tenderly, almost morbidly, humble and devout, so that, when a crowd pressed round him to receive some miraculous blessing at his hands, he said, "If the Lord would condescend to work any miracle here, I pray it might be to make me a good man": yet withal heroic and noble, so that his name is held in grateful veneration in the country of his mission, and he is worthily called Saint, and Apostle of the North.

From the religious, we return for a moment to follow a little further down the course of civil history. The reform which Louis the Pious had undertaken was one which could hardly have been carried out by the energy of any one man,—certainly not by him. The very attempt raised him up enemies enough, not only to baffle his plans for the Church, but to thwart his policy of state. His own sons opposed and rebelled against him. He married an alien queen, whose influence either paralyzed his will, or confirmed the rising jealousies. Outrageous and insolent demands were made of him, which he had no power to refuse. For the first time since the public penance of Theodosius, the sovereign of the empire was seen humbled before the Church. Weeping and in sack-cloth, he was constrained to sign an ignominious and false acknowledgment of guilt;—for the mercies he had shown, for the ravages he was powerless to prevent, for the division of the realm, by which he had given power to his sons, and for the strifes they had stirred up with one another. The warrior-chiefs about him could never



pardon his degradation. The people might compassionate, but the nobles would despise. Fresh calamities came; an invasion of the Normans, a defeat by the Moors, a rebellion of his sons. Louis was dethroned, and put into a convent. He died before the quarrel was decided, leaving his four sons to share the empire. Fraternal jealousy was ranged side by side with antipathies of race. Italy, Germany, and France were separated into independent nations at the great battle of Fontenai,\* where there perished of the hostile parties no less than forty thousand men.

To the imagination of the desolate period that followed, this battle was the destruction of the manhood of the Franks. The people's force and independence were already gone. They were inert and helpless before their invaders. The fury of the barbarian assaults was increased by "the vengeance of the serf and the rage of the apostate." Men fled from the oppression of their servitude, or the punishment of their crimes, and became outlaws and borderers. Leaguings themselves with the hordes of Northern pirates, they carried back terror and desolation to the land they had deserted. Those formidable fleets came unresisted upon the shores and passed up the rivers of France. While garments were to be had for baptizing, and favors for conversion, the pagans had shown no reluctance to embrace the Christian profession. But now that these were to be had no longer, they returned to Odin, the god of battle, and Thor, the thunderer. Their ships were adorned with the fearful heathen devices of the snake and dragon. When their ivory horn sounded on the river or along the shore, the wretched people had no leaders to rally them, and no courage to resist. They fled for refuge to the shrines and relics; but these appealed to no barbarian scruple. The shrines were violated; the relics, which had wrought so many marvels while the people had faith in them, were now helpless, and borne helplessly in the flight of priest and peasant. Men were glad to purchase liberty or life with means that only put fresh power for ravage into the invaders' hands. One convent was ransomed many times, then burned, when there was no more left

---

\* A. D. 843.

to ransom it. An archbishop was taken by the Moors, and his liberty purchased with a hundred and fifty pounds of silver, as many cloaks, as many swords, and as many slaves; but when they went to receive him, he was dead. When the marauders came, the king sent only to negotiate for how much spoil they might be bribed to stay away. It was an article of treaty with them, that, if one of their prisoners should escape, he should be given back, or a price paid for him; if a Norman was slain, his blood was redeemed at a stipulated price. Desolation and famine were spread through France. Earth was mingled with the meal of which the people made their bread. Forests grew up in the heart of the land. A chief who had gained some passing advantage had to cut his way through brambles to the cathedral where he was to render thanks. A single district was ravaged by three hundred wolves. A wooden fort, or stockade, which was built for the defence of the country, had no one to man it, and was rather of service to the pagans. Paris was saved from assault by the infamous expedient of the king's inducing them to ravage Burgundy instead, — he having some quarrel with that province. The bishops, who had more power, undertook to levy troops and provide for the common defence; but they were timid and uncertain, and the people begged them, "Defend the realm only by your prayers against the Northmen and the rest: do not try to protect us: if you wish for any help of ours, beg the apostolic lord not to set over us a king unable to help us at a distance against the sudden and frequent assaults of the heathen."\*

Hitherto the great estates had been all in the king's gift. He was jealous of the nobles, and wished to check their power; they were jealous of the people, and would not suffer them to combine for mutual defence. But at last the wretchedness of the land, or the threats of the nobles, wrung the king's unwilling consent. He made their lordships hereditary, and gave them a perpetual tenure of the land. This was the turning-point, — the true commencement of the feudal system.† It was a revolution sought alike by the nobles and the people. "Nothing was more popular than feudalism at its birth."

---

\* Michelet.

† A. D. 877.

It was a complete military organization of the whole country. Vigor and confidence began everywhere to be felt. Thirteen years before, it had been forbidden to build castles: now they sprang up in every district. Every available point of land was made a rampart. The rocky hill, the bold river-shore, were fortified by these massive and inaccessible structures, which first guarded from assault the people that clustered below, and afterwards became the strength of the strong arm of baronial tyranny, or the garrisons of numberless private wars; serving now in their decay as pictures in the landscape of Northern France, or adorning the course of the "castled Rhine."

The scene of our narrative is happily chosen, at a time when the changes of which we have spoken were still in germ. The coming calamities only serve to throw a sombre coloring upon the meditation of the old man who is supposed to recount his youthful enterprise in the train of Anschar, without interrupting the dramatic interest of the tale. In style, it affects the antique fashion of a chronicler, — not wholly without success, though the freshness of the story and the spirit of the dialogue are not a little clogged by it. It is not for us to criticize the faithfulness of the representation given of the manners, superstitions, legends, and races, which the writer introduces. That is his affair, not ours. In good faith, as readers, we must assume his good faith as author. His mind is evidently very familiar with a style of literature and mythology, which no one, to our knowledge, has used in English to as good purpose as he has done, except Sir Walter Scott, in some portions of "*The Pirate*." We do not, of course, compare the two authors in respect of narrative or constructive skill; but whatever advantage one may have in these, is more than made up to the other by the prodigious superiority of his point of view. Instead of the fading relic of an obsolete superstition, lingering in the nook of one rocky island, and enough to inspire one crazed and unhappy brain, we have here the gigantic and full-grown mythologies of the North, wrestling on their own ground with the competitor before whom they feel that they are doomed to fall. To an unlearned eye, the author seems to have caught the true spirit of Scald and Saga, and the genuine Scandina-



vian inspiration fills the strain that comes from the deeper recesses of the pagan faith.

The course of the story is very direct and simple. Anselm, a young monk of the school of New Corbey, and now in Anschar's bishopric at Hamburg, (the same who recounts the story in his old age to his friend Leonardus in Italy,) has shared his teacher's enthusiasm for the toil and peril of a distant mission. It is half with joy and half in foreboding that he receives the summons to accompany him; and under the guidance of the Saxon Count Gerold they journey through the forest to meet the Swedish merchants who are to escort the mission. On the voyage his ship becomes separated from the rest, and is taken by pirates. While they are contending over the spoil, he escapes, with Jarl, a young Swede, and in an open boat they finally succeed in crossing to the opposite shore. The house of the rich merchant Nial, whose fair daughter (as well as Jarl) is almost a Christian, introduces us to the Swedish superstition at home, the vague, ominous terror at the new faith, the priestess and the mysterious car of Freya. Departing thence, his guide is one of the wild half-Oriental race of Finns, who mourns his people's defeat before the Swede, and exhibits their more fantastic, rude, and poetic style of superstition. This figure is introduced with remarkable felicity and effect. As a specimen of the style of the narrative, we copy the pathetic myth in which he recounts the fortune of his people.

"There was a time when the Swede and the Finn stood alone in the forest; twin brethren they were, and all the wild creatures of the wood were theirs in common. Then came a mighty storm out of the North, and the great oaks snapped before it, and the rocks rolled down from the mountains. 'Brother,' said the Swede to the Finn, 'fierce and terrible is the tempest; who may withstand its might? There is shelter beneath the great oak trunk yonder; let us seek it while there is yet time.' So the Swede crept him under the tree that lay uprooted by the storm; but the Finn remained without, as before, nor did he shrink beneath the strength of the gale. Then Wainamoinen, the mighty, looked forth out of the clouds upon the tree that sheltered the Swede; and it rose slowly, and the boards and the beams fell into their places, and lo! it became a lofty house, such as those in which the Swedes dwell to this day. And the Finn looked upon its walls and its roofs, and saw how they stood firmly

against the storm, that grew ever fiercer and fiercer. So at last he longed himself for shelter, and he went and knocked at the door of the house ; but his brother looked forth and said, ' Nay, thou wouldst not come under the tree ; now wander as thou wilt through the forest, and find what protection thou canst : with me thou shalt not dwell.' So the Finn strayed far away through the wood ; but ever he held a firm front against the tempest, and his look was bolder under the black and stormy sky, than his brother's was beneath the rafters of his house. And since that day many sons have been born to either brother, but their dwelling is ever the same ; the Finns beneath the sky ; the Swedes under the darkened roofs that Wainamoinen first showed them how to lay upon the walls of their houses." — p. 182.

Arrived at the residence of King Biorn, Anselm rejoins his mission, and the day is presently fixed for a solemn discussion in the Althing, or assembly of all the Swedes. The gathering of the wilder mountaineers, the persons who mingle in the debate, the savage Berserk giant Skarpheddin, Herigar the king's counsellor and the stranger's friend (an historical character and name), with the temple and fanatic priests of the three great gods, give our author unlimited opportunity of descriptive detail, and are well managed to bring out the most striking features of Scandinavian manners and superstition. The assembly is violently interrupted by Skarpheddin, as champion of a troop of priests. The fair daughter of Nial (who has fully embraced the Christian faith) is seized as a doomed victim to the gods, and the lives of the missionaries are hardly spared until Anselm should return to the court of Louis, and bring back Nial himself, who is detained there as a sort of hostage, on his way from Byzantium. This journey introduces us to the Emperor Louis, his queen, Judith, and two Byzantine envoys, whose pompous luxury is somewhat wearily satirized. Nial proves to have become a Christian during his journey and residence at the court. He returns in all haste, just in time to be present on the day of the great Spring festival which should decide the fate of the captives, and to see the issue of the wager of battle between Skarpheddin and Jarl, who has meanwhile been seized and kept as prisoner in the great temple. He too has become a Christian ; and Skarpheddin, who has sought to guard himself with Christian spells, hiding in his breast a copy of the Gospels, has fallen before his sword.

The tide of popular feeling is turned. The great temple is assaulted and broken open. The captives are rescued; and family feuds are ended in the Christian baptism of peace.

We have presented the outline of the story, so as to show how simply, yet ingeniously, occasion is found for weaving in whatever may serve to illustrate the life of the North a thousand years ago. It is here that its interest and merit lie. As illustrative descriptions, once assuming their historical veracity, most of the characters drawn in this book are admirable; and even those which seem most hazardous and unreal, as the Berserk and the Finn, are, to say the least, thoroughly well sustained. Gerold, the Saxon count, Eywind, the Swedish trader, Gottschalk, the pirate, Herigar, the counsellor, Geirroda, the sorceress, Ospak, the seer, are all freshly and vigorously drawn; and the pictures of natural scenery, which frequently occur, are beautifully delicate and clear, as if sketched by one to whom it is all familiar ground. The larger historical portraits, as those of Charlemagne and his son, are thrown into the background, yet given with sufficient distinctness to add a certain interest and dignity to the whole. We never forget the immediate presence of powers that control great events, or the importance of the issue that is to be decided.

Of Anschar we see scarcely more than the dim portraiture already familiar. A little more of austere and resolute purpose, a little less of tender and visionary piety, — this is all the author gives us of the great apostle, whose name he has taken for his title, and whose character we looked to find brought out in full proportions. With the development of the tale he is necessarily connected not at all, except as his mission traces a slight line for it to follow. It is not for us, where much is given, to ask for something else, which was not even intended. Yet we feel as if it were an error to shun so scrupulously the historical points of this enterprise, and the historical reality of the man who guided it, — at least, after calling attention to them in so taking a title. We are sure that the research, imagination, and descriptive power shown in this volume, if bestowed as Thierry has bestowed the same in his "*Récits*," would produce a result of at least equal interest, and of far greater value.



Some such service as this might be done by some one ; and by whom so well as by our author ?

Another defect in this work, considered as a picture of the ninth century, is that its perspective is incomplete. We are very skilfully made aware of a large part of what is needful to the understanding of the position, but not of all. A little care would easily have included some features, to which we have already adverted, in speaking of the decline of the Carlovingian dynasty. The spiritual rule and incipient controversies of the Church, the social condition of the empire, and the Moorish power that still hung on the southern border of Christendom, would have added depth and fulness to the perspective ; yet they are not, perhaps, greatly missed. It is in the want of a distinct analysis, or apprehension, of the Christian thought and enterprise itself, that we find the chief deficiency. Anschar's mission had its significance as part of the external policy of the empire ; and even this, in its fulness, our author has failed to represent. But it had another significance, which grew out of the nature of the Christian belief, as then held and operative ; and this surely required to be well understood and amply set forth. We find here nothing but the most superficial view of it ; only the vague, abstract, colorless Christian faith, with the paraphernalia of the Romish ritual, its crucifix and silver bells striking the pagan mind as a new sort of spell or oracle. That faith as moulded by church discipline and monastic training into the most fervid and enthusiastic character it has ever borne ; the doctrine of the real presence, as Anschar undoubtedly learned it from his teacher ; the visions, tears, and mystic piety that were the apostle's preparation for his work ; the heroic enthusiasm which shows all the brighter as a recoil from clerical cowardice and corruption, and the courage which was all the greater as a conquest of the trembling dread with which these men faced the spectres of a still living superstition, and strove consciously with devils, — these are but feebly hinted at, or not at all. Anschar is simply the model missionary, pious, determined, and courageous. Neither he nor his companion is that missionary-monk of the ninth century, whose complete portraiture we wait yet to see. Where was his weakness as well as strength ; how the truth and falsity of his creed were mingled, so

that each perhaps was needful to his work ; how a corrupt and ambitious Church kept up the enthusiastic loyalty of its servants, or how a cowardly and divided Christendom could present so winning a front to a fierce paganism ; how Christian legend or festival came to terms with Northern superstition, adopting at the font what it could not drive from the altar, — these are questions which a book with the name and ability of this should not have left wholly untouched. The native legends of Scandinavia, with its fables of elf and fairy, which had their root in the soil, have survived in the popular mind their Christian substitutes of Church legend, and the superstitions of the South.\* What were the nature, the power, and the durability of that Catholic civilization which brought the Northern nations, a thousand years ago, into the widening circle of Christendom ?

But it would be ungracious to part with our author, who has given so largely and richly, in a mood of fault-finding because he has not answered all the hard questions we might be disposed to put. We have desired to call attention to that interesting period of time, which includes the great territorial conquests of the Church and the rapid culmination of its power. We are sincerely grateful for any thing that throws light on the circumstances of such a time. By a sort of proverb, it goes by the name of "the dark age"; and we are too easily content with the duskiest twilight, when we come within its boundaries. But it had light of its own, doubtless, as it certainly had vital warmth. The Catholic civilization — the grandest and most imposing structure of human history hitherto — was widening its bounds, and planting its deep roots. And that historical investigation, of importance inferior to none, which consists in tracing those lines of Christian development, will scarce find better aid for the present, than in such works as that which we have introduced to our readers.

J. H. A.

---

\* So we were told by Frederica Bremer, who spoke of Anschar with right Swedish veneration.

## ART. III. — PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.\*

THE very valuable and laborious work named below has just been completed, and appears in magnificent style. It is illustrated by forty steel plates of the first order of beauty and excellence, accurately painting to the eye the chief localities of Paul's apostolic labors; by numerous detailed maps and charts, the most recent and reliable; and by more than a hundred fine wood engravings, giving representations of coins, statues, medals, buildings, landscapes, and whatever else is adapted to throw an additional light and interest over the old yet ever novel narrative. We do not hesitate to say, that, taking it for all in all, it is by far the most creditable production of the kind that has been issued within the pale of the Church of England for many a long day. It is learned, thoughtful, elaborate; clearly betokening, in the accomplished and courteous editors, freshness, vigor, research, and more of earnestness and independence than are commonly seen in the theological writings of accredited members of the "Establishment." An air of refined scholarly taste and finish pervades these volumes, and many evidences of editorial gifts and conscientiousness, scattered here and there, are constantly meeting the reader, and yielding him pleasure. But perhaps we shall convey the most adequate conception of the work in the shortest space, by enumerating in order what seem to us its prominent merits, and then stating the required exceptions or qualifications to our praise.

Without saying more of what will at once strike every observer,—namely, the exquisite typographical beauty of the pages, and their extreme rhetorical correctness and elegance,—we specify as a high claim to regard for this work, its comprehensiveness of design, alike in the extent of subject it covers and the amount of information necessary to treat its details. It proposes to give a com-

---

\* *The Life and Letters of St. Paul; comprising a Complete Biography of the Apostle, and a Translation of his Letters inserted in Chronological Order.* By the REV. W. S. CONYBEARE, Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and the REV. J. S. HOWSON, Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1850-1852. 2 vols. 4to. pp. 492 and 573.



plete living picture of Paul himself, and of the circumstances amidst which he acted his extraordinary part. And this aim, in a large degree, is worthily fulfilled. As in a vivid panorama, the dramatic moments, the sharp-edged escapes, the touching episodes, and all the dazzling scenery of romantic fortunes and chivalrous deeds in the career of that inspired genius, hero, saint, martyr, sweep before us. In varying description, the sects, schools, synagogues, customs, feelings, of the Jews, — the condition, relations, and influence of Greek and Roman philosophy, art, government, soldiery, — the religions, amusements, business, vices, navigation, of the age, — the rise and spread of the early Church in humble obscurities through thickening perils and amid fiery dissensions, — the great strife between the Gentile believers and those Judaizers “who were determined to confine Christendom within the walls of the synagogue, and to put Christianity on the same footing with Pharisaism and Sadduceeism, as a tolerated Jewish sect,” — all arise clearly to our view.

A feature of special excellence, in this effort to call up from its tomb in renewed life the figure of a bygone age, is its most fresh and charming picture of the outward spots and scenes through which Paul passed. As we advance, all the land and water grows eloquent. The lights and shadows both of poetry and of history are on all sides; every rock towers as a monument, every current flows animated with some memory of the past. As we read, we seem to see “the earth, the sea, and the sky still combining for us in the same landscapes that met the eyes of the wayfaring Apostle. The plain of Cilicia, the snowy distances of Taurus, the cold and rapid stream of the Cydnus, the broad Orontes under the shadow of its steep banks, with their thickets of jasmine and oleander; the hills which stand about Jerusalem, the arched fountains cold in the ravines below, the flowery brooks that wash their consecrated bases; the capes and islands of the Grecian Sea, the craggy summit of Areopagus, the land-locked harbor of Syracuse, the towering cone of Etna, the voluptuous loveliness of the Campanian shore”; — all these are shown to us in such distinct outlines and colors, that we seem to feel ourselves journeying and resting with the journeying and resting Paul.

And then we have, interspersed along the biography, in the order in which it is supposed they were written, a new translation of all those "Epistles, which are to Paul's inward life what the mountains and rivers of Asia, Greece, and Italy are to his outward life, — the imperishable part which still remains to us, when all that time can ruin has passed away." Mr. Conybeare's version of the Letters of Paul is marked by great perspicuity and a good degree of force. It is not so closely literal as our common version, but is generally more clear and true. It is paraphrastic to that degree which is most useful and fitted for the intelligent common reader. Numerous texts are rendered with emphatic felicity. Let two examples suffice to show this. "Who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing." The obscurity and want of verbal connection here is entirely removed in Mr. Conybeare's happy and accurate translation: "Who hath given faith to our telling? So then faith cometh by telling." Again, at the close of the letter to the Galatians, where the authorized version reads, "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand," our author shows that Paul is calling attention to his autograph signature in proof of the genuineness of the epistle, written at his dictation by an amanuensis: "Observe the size of the characters in which I have written to you with my own hand." Good service is frequently done the reader in this translation by the particular attention paid to elucidating the transitions, so thick and swift in Paul's style, from one point of argument or sentiment to another.

A further merit in our editors is the judicious use they make of their copious learning, now in relevant quotations from the Fathers or the classics, now in illustrative accounts of Church traditions, now in various other useful forms. We give two or three instances. In the New Testament all the references to Christ in his glorified state, save one, represent him as *seated* at the right hand of the Father. In the dying vision of Stephen he is seen *standing*. "It is as if — according to Chrysostom's beautiful thought — he had risen from his throne to succor and receive his persecuted servant." Again, speaking of Paul's presence at the martyrdom of Stephen, our authors, tracing his conversion partly to the influences of

that hour, say, it is hardly too much to think, with Augustine, that the Church owes Paul to the prayer of Stephen ;—"Si Stephanus non orasset, Ecclesia Paulum non haberet." The little chapel Domine Quo Vadis, in the outskirts of Rome, arose, our authors tell us, from the following sweet and beautiful tradition. Peter, in fear of his life, was fleeing from Rome over the Appian Way in the early dawn. Suddenly his Lord met him. The impulsive Apostle threw himself at his Master's feet, and exclaimed, "Domine, quo vadis?"—"Lord whither goest thou?" The Saviour looked mournfully upon him, and replied, "Venio iterum crucifigi,"—"I go to be crucified again." The Apostle rose up, rebuked and penitent, returned to Rome, and was martyred.

The last trait of excellence which we shall mention in this work is the degree of freedom and candor it reveals, a degree unusual with the denomination to which its editors belong. For instance, they have awaked, to use their own words, "from that pleasing dream which represented the primitive Church as a society of angels, and now behold the reality, the existence therein of so many forms of error and sin and conflict." (Vol. I. p. 488.) They confess that "the Apostles were mistaken in expecting the second coming of Christ during their lives, as they plainly did." (Vol. II. p. 496.) They admit that "inspiration does not preserve from unessential errors, such as questions of chronology." (Vol. I. p. 188.) They own that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by Paul. They cogently argue that the Epistle to the Ephesians was never written to *them*, but probably to the Laodiceans. Their knowledge forces them to these concessions, and they frankly allow them. This is a credit to them, — though it is limited.

Thus we are led to those qualifications of our commendation of these volumes that justice compels us to make. A theological preconception and prejudice in the mind of the translator have induced him to render many verses of Paul's Epistles unfairly, imparting to some words and sentiments a Calvinistic twist and tinge not originally belonging to them; e. g. Romans iii. 25, 26. The version being explanatory, rather than literal, of course partakes of the doctrinal views of Mr. Conybeare as well as of St. Paul. An Episcopalian bias is ap-



parent in the analysis of the constitution of the primitive Church. Vestiges of superstition, indications of weakness, appear in the accounts given of the Demoniacs, and of the Heathen Oracles. The work is essentially, as well as ostensibly, a popular production, adapted to the common reader, not calculated for the profound student. Although it does contain acute critical remarks and valuable information, — for example, a comparative table showing that seventy-eight verses of the Epistle to the Colossians have expressions identical with those in the Epistle to the Ephesians (so called), — still it is not a work for the thorough critic. It retains false translations and spurious readings in the text, and disowns them in the notes; e. g. Phil. ii. 6; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Its account of the early heresies is very superficial. It treats a great many questions of the utmost moment incompletely and unsatisfactorily. Regarded as a deep philosophical treatment, or as pretending to be a theological contribution, it would be a failure, it would be worth very little; but viewed, as it should be, as a popular history for the common reader, it is a very instructive, even a magnificent production. It is not a work of genius, of original insight and construction, but a work of industrious talent, of collection and arrangement. It does not grasp, and analyze, and show us the inmost peculiarities and courses of the time, but it gathers and groups and colors the outward details. For the former work, eminently uniting at the same time all the excellences of the latter, we look to no other man than James Martineau, whose long promised "*Christianity of Paul*" we wait with highest expectation.

The Apostle Paul, being freshly brought to the notice of scholars in the work we have been speaking of, we now propose, as a worthy way of occupying several more of these pages, to set forth a brief sketch of his doctrine of the last things. Some important points of Paul's theology we shall be obliged to overlook, all our room being wanted for the narrower theme designated at the head of this article.

The principal difficulty in getting at the system of thought and faith in the mind of Paul arises from the fragmentary character of his extant writings. They are not complete treatises drawn out in independent state-

ments, but special letters full of latent implications. They were written to meet particular emergencies, — to give advice, to convey or ask information and sympathy, to argue or decide, concerning various matters to a considerable extent of a personal or local and temporal nature. Obviously their author never suspected they would be the permanent and immensely influential documents they have since become. They were not composed as orderly developments or full presentations of a creed, but rather as supplements to more adequate oral instruction previously imparted. He says to the Thessalonians, "Brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or by our epistle." Several of his letters also, perhaps many, have been lost. He exhorts the Colossians to "read likewise the epistle from Laodicea." In his present First Epistle to the Corinthians, he intimates that he had previously corresponded with them, in the words, "I wrote to you in a letter." There are good reasons, too, for supposing that he transmitted other epistles of which we have now no account. Owing, therefore, to the facts, that his principal instructions were given by word of mouth, and that his surviving writings set forth no systematic array of doctrines, we have no choice left, if we desire to know what his opinions concerning the Last Things were, when adequately deduced and correctly arranged, but to exercise our learning and our faculties upon the imperfect discussions and the significant hints and clews in his extant epistles. Bringing these together in the light of contemporary Pharisaic and Christian conceptions and opinions, we may construct a system from them which will represent his theory, as the naturalist, from a few fragmentary bones, describes the entire skeleton to which they belonged. As we proceed to follow this process, we must particularly remember the leading notions in the doctrinal belief of the Jews at that period, and the fact that Paul himself was "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel," "after the most straitest order of the sect, a Pharisee." When on trial at Jerusalem he cried, "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope of the resurrection of the dead I am called in question." We can hardly suppose that he would entirely throw off the influence and form of the Pharisaic

dogmas, and grasp Christianity in its pure spirituality. It is most reasonable to expect, what we shall find actually the fact, that he would mix the doctrinal and passionate results of his Pharisaic training with the teachings of Christ, thus forming a composite system considerably modified from any then existing. Indeed, a great many obscure texts in Paul may be made perspicuous by citations from the old Talmudists. Considering the value and the importance of this means of illustrating the New Testament, it is neglected by modern commentators in a very remarkable manner. But we must hasten to commence our task.

In common with his countrymen and the Gentiles, Paul undoubtedly believed in a world of light and bliss situated over the sky, where the Deity, surrounded by his angels, reigns in immortal splendor. According to the Greeks, Zeus and the other gods, with a few select heroes, lived there an imperishable life. According to the Hebrews, there was "the house of Jehovah," "the habitation of eternity," "the world of holy angels." The Old Testament contains many sublime allusions to this place. Jacob in his dream saw a ladder set up that reached unto heaven, and the angels were ascending and descending upon it. Fixing his eyes upon the summit, the patriarch exclaimed, not referring, as is commonly supposed, to the ground on which he lay, but to the opening in the sky through which the angels were passing and repassing, "Surely this is the house of God, and this the gate of heaven." Jehovah is described as "riding over the heaven of heavens"; as "treading upon the arch of the sky"; the firmament is spoken of as the solid floor of his abode, where "he layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters," the "waters above," which the book of Genesis says were "divided from the waters beneath." Though this divine world on high was, in the early ages, almost universally regarded as a local reality, it was not conceived by Jews or Gentiles to be the destined abode of human souls. It was thought to be exclusively occupied by Jehovah and his angels, or by the Gods and their messengers. Only here and there were scattered a few dim traditions, or poetic myths, of a prophet, a hero, a god-descended man, who, as a special favor, had been taken up to the supernal mansions. The common des-



tinuation of the disembodied spirits of men was the dark, stupendous realms of the under-world. As Augustine observes, "Christ died after many; he rose before any: by dying he suffered what many had suffered before; by rising he did what no one had ever done before." \* These ideas of the celestial and the infernal localities, and of the fate of man, were of course entertained by Paul when he became a Christian. A few texts by way of evidence of this fact will here suffice. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and those on earth, and those under the earth." "He that descended first into the lower parts of the earth is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens." The untenableness of that explanation which makes the descent into the lower parts of the earth refer to Christ's descent to the earth from his preëxistent state in heaven, must be evident to every candid and well-informed mind. Irenæus, discussing this very text from Ephesians, exposes the absurdity and stigmatizes the *heresy* of those "qui dicunt inferas quidem esse hunc mundum." † "I knew a man caught up to the third heaven, . . . . caught up into paradise." The threefold heaven of the Jews, here alluded to, was, first, the region of the air, supposed to be inhabited by evil spirits. Paul repeatedly expresses this idea, as when he speaks of "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience," and when he says, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness, against wicked spirits in heavenly places." The second heaven comprised the region of the planetary bodies. The third lay beyond the firmament, and was the actual residence of God and the angelic hosts. These quotations, sustained as they are by the well-known previous opinions of the Jews, as well as by numerous unequivocal texts in the writings of the other Apostles, and by scores of additional ones in those of Paul, are conclusive evidence that he believed in the received heaven above the blue ether and stellar dome, and in the received Hadean abyss beneath the earth. In the absence of all evidence to the contrary,

---

\* Enarratio in Psalmum XC.

† Irenæi Adversus Hæreses, Lib. V. cap. 31.

every presumption justifies the supposition that he also believed, as we know all his orthodox contemporaries did, that that under-world was the abode of all men after death, and that that over-world was solely the dwelling-place of God and the angels. Nay, we are not left to conjecture, for he expressly declares of God, that he "dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto." This conclusion will be abundantly established in the course of the following exposition.

With these preliminaries we are prepared to examine and see what was Paul's doctrine of death and of salvation. There are two prevalent theories on this subject, both of which we deem partly Scriptural, neither of them wholly so. On the one extreme, the consistent disciple of Augustine, the historic Calvinist, attributes to the Apostle the belief, that the sin of Adam was the sole cause of literal death, that but for Adam's fall men would have lived on the earth for ever, or else have been translated bodily to heaven without any previous process of death. That such really was not the view held by Paul we are perfectly convinced. Indeed, there is one prominent feature in his faith which by itself goes far to prove that the disengagement of the soul from the material frame did not seem to him an abnormal event, caused by the contingency of sin. We refer to his doctrine of two bodies, the "outward man" and the "inward man," the "earthly house" and the "heavenly house," the "natural body" and the "spiritual body." Neander says this is "an express assertion" of Paul's belief that man was not literally made mortal by sin, but was naturally destined to emerge from the flesh into a higher form of life.\* There is no misgiving in our mind but Paul thought that, in the original plan of God, man was intended to drop his gross, corruptible body, and put on an incorruptible one, like the "glorious body" of the risen Christ. He even distinctly declares, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." Therefore we cannot interpret the word "death" to mean *merely* the separation of the soul from its present tabernacle, when he says, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men."

---

\* Planting and Training, Ryland's Translation, p. 240.

On the other extreme, the fully-developed Pelagian, and some Unitarians, hold that the word "death" is always used in the arguments of Paul in a spiritual or figurative sense, *merely* meaning moral alienation from God in guilt, misery, and despair. Undoubtedly it is used thus in many instances; as when it is written, "I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin rose to life and I died." But in still more numerous cases it means, as seems beyond all question, something more than the consciousness of sin and its resulting wretchedness in the breast, and implies something external, mechanical, visible, as it were. For example: "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead"; no one who reads the context of this sentence can fail to see that the terms "death" and "resurrection" antithetically balance each other, and refer not to an inward experience, but to an outward event, not to a moral change, but to the physical descent and resurrection. It is certain that here the words are not employed in a moral sense. The phraseology Paul uses in stating the connection of the sin of Adam with death, the connection of the resurrection of Christ with immortal life, is too peculiar, emphatic, and extensive, not to be loaded with a more general and vivid significance than the simple unhappiness of a sense of guilt, the simple peace and joy of a reconciled conscience. The advocates, then, of both theories, — the Calvinist asserting that Paul supposed sin to be the only reason why we do not live eternally in the world with our present organization, and the Rationalist asserting that the Apostle never employs the word "death" except with a purely interior signification, — are alike beset by insuperable difficulties, perplexed by passages which defy their fair analysis and force them either to use a violent interpretation or to confess their ignorance.

We must therefore seek out some third view, which, rejecting the errors, shall combine the truths, and supply the defects, of the two former. We have now to present such a view, — a theory of the Pauline doctrine of the last things which obviously explains and fills out all the related language of the Epistles. We suppose he unfolded it fully in his preaching, while in his supplementary and personal letters he only alludes to such dis-



connected parts of it as then rose upon his thoughts. A systematic development of it as a whole, with copious allusions and labored defences, was not needed then, as it might seem to us to have been. For the fundamental notions on which it rested were the common belief of the nation and age; geology and astronomy had not disturbed the credit of a definitely located hades and heaven, nor had free metaphysics sharpened the common mind to sceptical queries. The view itself, as we conceive it occupied the mind of Paul, is this. Death was a part of the creative plan for us from the first, simply loosing the spirit from its corruptible body, clothing it with an ethereal vehicle, and immediately translating it to heaven. Sin marred this plan, alienated us from the Divine favor, introduced all misery, physical and moral, and doomed the soul, upon the fall of its earthly house, to descend into the slumberous gloom of the under-world. Thus *death* was changed from a pleasant organic fulfilment and deliverance, spiritual investiture and heavenly ascent, to a painful punishment condemning the naked ghost to a residence below the grave. Herein is the explanation of the word "death," as used by Paul in reference to the consequence of Adam's offence. Christ came to reveal the free grace and gift of God in redeeming us from our doom and restoring our heavenly destiny. This he exemplified, in accordance with the Father's will, by dying, descending into the dreary world of the dead, vanquishing the forces there, rising thence, and ascending to the right hand of the throne of heaven as our forerunner. On the very verge of the theory just stated as Paul's, Neander hovers in his exposition of the Apostle's views, but fails to grasp its theological scope and consequences. Krabbe declares, that "death did not arise from the native perishableness of the body, but from sin."\* This statement Neander controverts, maintaining that "sin introduced no essential change in the physical organization of man, only in the manner in which his earthly existence terminates: had it not been for sin, death would have been only the form of a higher development of life."† Exactly so, we say. With inno-

---

\* Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Tode, von Dr. Otto Krabbe, elftes Cap., Seite 192.

† Neander's Planting and Training, Lib. VI. cap. 1.

cence, the soul at death would have ascended pleasantly, in a new body, to heaven; but sin compelled it to descend painfully, without any body, to hades. We will proceed to cite a few of the principal texts from which this general outline has been inferred and constructed.

The substance of the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans may be thus stated. As by the offence of one, sin entered into the world, and the judgment of the law came upon all men in a sentence of condemnation unto death, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift of God came upon all men in a sentence of justification unto life; that as sin, by Adam's offence, hath reigned unto death, so grace, by Christ's righteousness, might reign unto eternal life. Here condemnation to death,—the curse entailed by Adam,—and justification to life,—the blessing brought by Christ,—are balanced against each other. The one term measures the contrasted meaning of the other. And here, as elsewhere, the implication unquestionably is, that what Adam incurred Christ removed, and what Adam forfeited Christ restored. Now we maintain that the words "death" and "life" cannot in the present instance be entirely explained in their spiritual sense, as signifying disturbance and woe in the breast, or peace and bliss there, because the whole connected discourse is not upon the internal contingent experience of individuals, but upon the common necessity of the race, an objective sentence passed upon humanity, followed by a public gift of reversal and annulment. So, too, we deny that the words can be justly taken in their strictly literal sense, as meaning cessation or continuance of physical existence on the earth, because, in the first place, that would be inconsistent with the doctrine of a spiritual body within the fleshly one, and of a glorious inheritance reserved in heaven, a doctrine by which Paul plainly shows that he recognized a natural organic provision, irrespective of sin, for a change in the form and locality of human existence. Secondly, we submit that death and life here cannot mean departure from the body or continuance in it, because that is a matter with which Christ's mission did in no way interfere, but left it exactly as it was before; whereas, in the thing really meant by Paul, Christ is represented as standing, at least partially, in the same relation between life and men, that Adam

stands in between death and men. The reply to the question, What is that relation? will at once define the genuine signification of the terms "death" and "life" in the instance under review. And thus we answer it. The death brought on mankind by Adam was not only internal wretchedness, but also the condemnation of the disembodied soul to the under-world: the life they were assured of by Christ was not only internal blessedness, but also the deliverance of the soul from its subterranean prison and its reception into heaven in a "body celestial," according to its original destiny had sin not befallen. Our interpretation is explicitly put forth by Theodoret in his comments on this same passage (Rom. v. 15-18). He says: "There must be a correspondence between the disease and the remedy. Adam's sin subjected him to the power of death and the tyranny of the Devil. In the same manner that Adam was compelled to descend into the under-world, we all are associates in his fate. Thus, when Christ rose, the whole humankind partook in his vivification." \* Origen also — and who, after the Apostles themselves, knew their thoughts and their use of language so well as he? — emphatically declares, — in exposition of the expression of Paul, "the wages of sin is death," — that "the under-world in which souls are detained is called death." †

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." These words cannot be explained thus: "As in Adam the necessity of physical death came on all, so in Christ that necessity shall be removed"; because Christ's mission did not touch physical death, which was still reigning as ever before Paul's eyes. Neither can the passage signify, "As through Adam wretchedness is the portion of every heart of man, so through Christ blessedness shall be given to every heart"; because, while the language itself does not hint that thought, the context demonstrates that the real reference is not to an inward experience, but to an outward event, not to the personal regeneration of the soul, but to a general resurrection of the dead. The time referred to is the second coming of Christ; and the force of the text must be this: As by

---

\* *Impatib.*, Dialogue III. pp. 132, 133, ed. Sirmondi.

† *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.*, Lib. VI. cap. 6, sect. 6.



our bodily likeness to the first man and genetic connection with him through sin we all die like him, that is, leave the body and go into the under-world, and remain there; so by our spiritual likeness to the second man, and redeeming connection with him through the free grace of God, we shall all rise thence like him revived and restored. Adam was the head of a condemned race doomed to hades by the visible occurrence of death in lineal descent from him; Christ, the head of a pardoned race destined for heaven in consonance with the plain token of his resurrection and ascension. Again, the Apostle writes: "In the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we (who are then living) shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality. Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory. O Death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory?'" The writer evidently exults in the thought, that at the second coming of Christ death shall lose its retributive character, and the under-world be baffled of its expected prisoners, because the living shall instantly experience the change of bodies fitting them to ascend to heaven with the returning and triumphant Lord. Paul also announces that "Jesus Christ hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light." The word "death" here cannot mean physical dissolution, because Christ did not abolish that. It cannot denote personal sin and unhappiness, because that would not correspond with and sustain the obvious meaning of the contrasted member of the sentence. Its adequate and consistent sense is this. God intended that man should pass from a preliminary existence on earth to an eternal life in heaven; but sin thwarted this glorious design, and altered our fate to a banishment into the cheerless under-world. But now, by the teachings and resurrection of Christ, we are assured that God of his infinite goodness has determined freely to forgive us and restore our original destination. Our descent and abode below are abolished, and our heavenly immortality made clear. We will cite only one more passage in this connection. Paul writes to the Corinthians: "We earnestly desire to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that,

being clothed, we shall not be found naked. Not that we desire to be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality may be swallowed up of life." In these remarkable words the Apostle expresses several particulars of what we have already presented as his general doctrine. He states his conviction, that, when his "earthly house of this tabernacle" dissolves, there is a "divinely constructed, heavenly, and eternal house" prepared for him. He expresses his desire, at the coming of the Lord, not to be dead, but still living, and then to be divested of his earthly body and invested with the heavenly body, that thus being fitted for translation to the incorruptible kingdom of God, he might not be found a naked shadow or ghost in the under-world. Ruckert says, in his commentary, and the best critics all agree with him: "Paul herein desires to become immortal without passing the gates of death." Language similar to the foregoing in its peculiar phrases is found in the Jewish Cabbala. The Zohar describes the ascent of the soul to heaven clothed with splendor, and afterwards illustrates its meaning in these terms: "As there is given to the soul a garment with which she is clothed in order to establish her in this world, so there is given her a garment of heavenly splendor in order to establish her in that world."\* So in the "Ascension of Isaiah the Prophet,"—an apocryphal book written by some Jewish Christian as early, without possible doubt, as the close of the second century,—the following passages occur. Speaking of what was revealed to him in heaven the prophet says: "There I saw all the saints, from Adam, without the clothing of the flesh: I viewed them in their heavenly clothing like the angels who stood there in great splendor." Again he says: "All the saints from heaven in their heavenly clothing shall descend with the Lord and dwell in this world, while the saints who have not died shall be clothed like those who come from heaven. Then the general resurrection will take place, and they will ascend together to heaven."† Schoettgen, commenting on this text (2 Cor. v. 2) likewise quotes a large number of examples of like phraseology, from Rabbinical writers. The state-

---

\* Lawrence's *Ascensio Isaie Vatis*, Appendix, p. 163.

† Ibid., cap. 9, v. 7, 9; cap. 4.

ments so far made and proofs offered will be repeatedly and amply illustrated and confirmed as we now go on to consider the chief component parts of the Pauline scheme of the last things. For, having presented the general outline, it will be useful, in treating so complex and difficult a theme, to analyze it by examining its details.

We are met upon the threshold of our inquiry by the broad and essential question, "What, according to Paul, was the mission of Christ? What did he accomplish? A clear and adequate reply to this question comprises three distinct propositions, which we proceed to state in order, and to establish. First, the Apostle plainly represents the resurrection, and not the crucifixion, as the efficacious feature in Christ's work of redemption. When we recollect the almost universal prevalence of the opposite notion among existing sects, it is astonishing how clear it is that Paul generally dwells upon the dying of Christ solely as the necessary preliminary to his rising. "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain; ye are yet in your sins." These words are irreconcilable with that doctrine which connects our "justification" with the atoning death, and not with the typical resurrection, of Christ. "That Christ died for our sins, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day." To place a vicarious stress upon the first clause of this text is as arbitrary as it would be to place it upon the second; but naturally emphasize the third clause, and all is clear. The weighty inferences and practical exhortations drawn from the mission of Christ are not usually connected in any essential manner with his painful death, but directly with his glorious resurrection out from among the dead below unto the heavenly blessedness. "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Sinking into the water, when "buried by baptism into the death of Christ," was to those initiated into the Christian religion a symbol of the descent of Christ among the dead; rising out of the water was a symbol of the ascent of Christ into heaven. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." When Paul cries exultingly, "Thanks be to God, who through Christ giveth us the victory over



the sting of death, and the strength of sin," Jerome says, "We cannot and dare not interpret this victory otherwise than by the *resurrection* of the Lord." \* Commenting on the text, "To this end Christ both died and lived again, that he might reign both over the dead and the living," Theodoret says, that Christ, going through all these events, "promised a resurrection to us all." Paul makes no appeal to us to believe in the death of Christ, to believe in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, but he unequivocally affirms, "If thou shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Paul conceived that Christ died in order to rise again and convince men that the Father would freely deliver them from the bondage of death in the under-world. All this took place on account of sin, was only made requisite by sin, one of whose consequences was the subterranean confinement of the soul, which otherwise, upon deserting its clayey tent, would immediately have been clothed with a spiritual body and have ascended to heaven. That is to say, Christ "was delivered because of our offences, and was raised again because of our justification." In Romans viii. 10, the preposition *διὰ* occurs twice in exactly the same construction as in the text just quoted. In the latter case the authors of the common version have rendered it "because of." They should have done so in the other instance, in accordance with the natural force and established usage of the word. The meaning is: Our offences had been committed, therefore Christ was delivered into hades; our pardon had been decreed, therefore Christ was raised into heaven. Such as we have now stated is the real material which has been distorted and exaggerated into the Calvinistic doctrine of the vicarious atonement, with all its dread concomitants. The believers of that doctrine suppose themselves obliged to accept it by the language of the Epistles. But the view above maintained as that of Paul, solves every difficulty, and gives an intelligible and consistent meaning to all the phrases usually thought to legitimate the Calvinistic scheme of redemption. While we deny the correctness of the Calvinistic interpretation of those passa-

---

\* Comm. in Osee, Lib. III. cap. 13.

ges in which occur such expressions as "Christ gave himself for us," "died for our sins," we freely admit the inadequacy of the explanations of them which have been proposed by some Unitarians, and assert that their genuine force is this: Christ died and rose that we might be freed through faith from the great entailed consequence of sin, the bondage of the under-world; beholding through his ascension our heavenly destination restored. "God made him who knew no sin to be sin on our account, that we might become the righteousness of God in him," might through faith in him be assured of salvation. In other words, Christ, who was not exposed to the evils brought on men by sin, did not think his divine estate a thing eagerly to be retained, but descended to the estate of man, underwent the penalties of sin as if he were himself a sinner, and then rose to the right hand of God, by this token to assure men of God's gracious determination to forgive them and reinstate them in their forfeited primal privileges. "If we be reconciled by his death, much more shall we be saved by his life." That is, if Christ's coming from heaven as an ambassador from God to die, convinces us of God's pardoning good-will towards us, much more does his rising again into heaven, where he now lives, deliver us from the fear of the under-world condemnation, and assure us of the heavenly salvation. Except in the light and with the aid of the theory we have been urging, a large number of texts like the foregoing cannot be interpreted without constructive violence, and even with that violence cannot convey their full point and power.

Secondly, in Paul's doctrine of the redeeming work of Christ we recognize something distinct from any subjective effect in animating and purifying the hearts and lives of men. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." "In Christ we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Nothing but the most desperate and outrageous exegesis can make these and many similar texts signify simply the purging of individual breasts from their offences and guilt. Seeking the genuine meaning of Paul himself, regardless of consequences, we are forced to agree with the overwhelming majority of the critics and believers of all Christendom, from the very times of the Apostles till now, and

declare that these passages refer to an outward deliverance of men by Christ, the removal by him of a common doom resting on the race in consequence of sin. What Paul supposed that doom was, and how he thought it was removed, we will now show. It is necessary to premise, that in Paul's writings the phrase "the righteousness of God" is often used by metonymy to mean God's mode of counting sinners righteous, and is equivalent to "the Christian method of salvation." "By the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified, but the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, freely justifying them through the redemption that is in Christ." How evidently in this verse "the righteousness of God" denotes God's method of justifying the guilty by a free pardon proclaimed through Christ! The Apostle employs the word "faith" in a kindred technical manner, sometimes meaning by it "promise," sometimes the whole evangelic apparatus used to establish faith or prove the realization of the promise. "What if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect?" Evidently by "faith" is intended "promise" or "purpose." "Is the law against the promises of God? God forbid! But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Here "faith" plainly means "the manifested fulfilment of the promises," — it means the Gospel. Again: "Whereof he hath offered faith to all, in that he hath raised him from the dead." "Hath offered faith" here signifies unquestionably, as the common version well expresses it, "hath given assurance," or hath exemplified the proof. "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." In this instance "faith" certainly means Christianity, in contradistinction to Judaism, and "justification by faith" is equivalent to "salvation by the grace of God, shown through the mission of Christ." It is not so much internal and individual in its reference, as it is public and general. We do believe that no candid man, sacredly resolved to admit the truth, can study, with a purposed reference to this point, all the passages in Paul's Epistles where the word "faith" occurs, without being perfectly



convinced that, for the most part, it is used in an objective sense, in contradistinction to the law, as synonymous with the Gospel, the new dispensation of grace. And so "justification by faith" does not usually mean salvation through personal belief, either in the merits of the Redeemer or in any thing else, but means salvation by the plan revealed in the Gospel, which is the free remission of sins by the forbearance of God. In those instances where "faith" is used in a subjective sense for personal belief, it is never described as the effectual *cause* of salvation, but as the condition of personal *assurance* of salvation. Grace has outwardly come to all, but only the believers inwardly know it. This Pauline use of terms in technical senses lies broadly on the face of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. New Testament lexicons and commentaries, by the best scholars of every denomination, acknowledge it and illustrate it. Mark now these texts. "And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." "To declare his righteousness, that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." "What things were gain to me (under Judaism) I counted loss in comparison with Christ, that I may be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God through faith in Christ." "By the deeds of the law no man can be justified," — "but ye are saved through faith." We submit that all these passages, and very many others in the Epistles, find a perfect explanation in the following outline of faith, commenced in the mind of Paul while he was a Pharisee, completed when he was a Christian. The righteousness of the law, the method of salvation by keeping the law, is impossible. The sin of the first man broke that whole plan, and doomed all souls helplessly to the under-world. If a man now should keep every tittle of the law without reservation, it would not release him from the bondage below and secure for him an ascent to heaven. But what the law could not do is done for us in Christ. Sin having destroyed the righteousness of the law, that is, the fatal penalty of hades having rendered salvation by the law impossible, the righteousness of God, that is, a new method of salva-

tion, has been brought to light. God has sent his Son to die, descend into the under-world, rise again, and return to heaven, to proclaim to men the glorious tidings of justification by faith, that is, a dispensation of grace freely annulling the great consequence of sin, and inviting them to heaven in the Redeemer's footsteps. Paul most unequivocally declares that Christ broke up the bondage of the under-world by his irresistible entrance and exit, in the following text: "When he had descended first into the lower parts of the earth, he ascended up on high, leading a multitude of captives." What can be plainer than that! The same thought is also contained in another passage, a passage which was the source of those tremendous pictures, so frequent in the cathedrals of the Middle Ages, — *Christus spoliat Infernum*: "God hath forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and took it away, nailing it to Christ's cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them, openly triumphing over them in Christ." The entire theory which underlies the exposition we have just set forth, is stated in so many words in the passage we are now about to cite. For the word "righteousness" — in order to make the meaning more perspicuous — we simply substitute "method of salvation," which is unquestionably its signification here. "They [the Jews], being ignorant of God's method of salvation, and going about to establish their own method, have not submitted themselves unto God's. For Christ is the end of the law for a way of salvation to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the method of salvation which is of the law, that the man who *doeth* these things shall be blessed in them. But the method of salvation which is of faith ["faith" here means the Gospel, Christianity] speaketh on this wise: Say not in thy heart, 'Who shall ascend into heaven?' that is, to bring Christ down. Or, 'Who shall descend into the under-world?' that is, to bring up Christ again from among the dead." This has been done already, once for all. "And if thou shalt believe in thine heart that God *hath* raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The Apostle avows that his "heart's desire and his prayer unto God for Israel is, that they may be saved"; and he asserts that they cannot be

saved by the Law of Moses, but only by the Gospel of Christ, that is, "Faith," that is, the "Dispensation of Grace."

Paul's conception of the foremost and essential feature in Christ's mission is precisely this. He came to deliver men from the stern law of Judaism, which could not wipe away their transgressions nor save them from hades, and to establish them in the free grace of Christianity, which justifies them from all past sin and seals them for heaven. What could be a more explicit declaration of our assertion than the following? "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law." Herein is the explanation of that fierce and perilous combat which Paul waged so many years, and in which he proved victorious, — the great battle between the Gentile and the Judaizing Christians; a subject of altogether singular importance, without a minute acquaintance with which a very large part of the New Testament cannot be understood. "Christ gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God." Now the Hebrew terms corresponding with the English terms "present world" and "future world" were used by the Jews to denote the Mosaic and the Messianic dispensations. We believe — with Schoettgen and other good authorities — that such is the sense of the phrase "present world" in the instance before us. Not only is that interpretation sustained by the *usus loquendi*. It is also the only defensible meaning; for the effect of the establishment of the Gospel was not to deliver men from the present world, though it did deliver them from the hopeless bondage of Judaism, wherein salvation was impossible. And that is precisely the argument of the whole Epistle to the Galatians, in which the text occurs. In a succeeding chapter, while speaking expressly of the external forms of the Jewish law, Paul says, "By the cross of Christ the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world"; and he instantly adds, by way of explanation, "for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision." Undeniably, "world" here means "Judaism"; as Rosenmüller says, *Judaica vanitas*. In another Epistle, while expostulating with his readers on the folly



of subjecting themselves to observances "in meat and drink, and new moons and sabbaths," after "the handwriting of ordinances that was against them had been blotted out, taken away, nailed to the cross," Paul remonstrates with them in these words: "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?" We should suppose that no intelligent person could question that this means, "Now that by the Gospel of Christ ye are emancipated from the technical requisitions of Judaism, why are ye subject to its ordinances, as if ye were still living under its rule?" — so many of the best commentators agree in saying, "*tanquam viventes adhuc in Judaismo.*" From these collective passages, and others like them, we draw the conclusion in Paul's own words, that, "When we were children, we were in bondage under the rudiments of the world," "the weak and beggarly elements" of Judaism, but now that "the fulness of the time has come, and God has sent forth his Son to redeem us," we are called "to receive the adoption of sons," and "become heirs of God," inheritors of a heavenly destiny.

We think that every intelligent and candid reader, who is familiar with Paul's Epistles, will at once recognize the following features in his belief and teaching. First, all mankind alike were under sin and condemnation. "Jews and Gentiles all are under sin." "All the world is subject to the sentence of God." And we maintain that that condemning sentence consisted, partly at least, in the banishment of their disembodied souls to hades. Secondly, "a promise was given to Abraham," before the introduction of the Mosaic dispensation, "that in his seed [that is, in Christ] all the nations of the earth should be blessed." When Paul speaks, as he does in numerous instances, of "the hope of eternal life which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began," "the promise given before the foundation of the world," "the promise made of God unto the fathers, that God would raise the dead," the date referred to is not when the decree was formed in the eternal counsels of God, previous to the origin of the earth, but when the covenant was made with Abraham, before the establishment of the Jewish dispensation. The thing prom-

ised very plainly was, according to Paul's idea, a redemption from hades and an ascension to heaven, for this is fully implied in his "expectation of the resurrection of the dead" from the intermediate state, and their being "clothed in celestial bodies." This promise made unto Abraham by God, to be fulfilled by Christ, "the law, which was four hundred and thirty years afterwards, could not disannul." That is, — as any one must see by the context, — the law could not secure the inheritance of the thing promised, but was only a temporary arrangement on account of transgressions, "until the seed should come to whom the promise was made." In other words, there was "no mode of salvation by the law"; "the law could not give life," for if it could it would have "superseded the promise," made it without effect, whereas the inviolable promise of God was, that in the one seed of Abraham, that is, in Christ, alone should salvation be preached to all that believed. "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made useless, and the promise is made useless." In the mean time, until Christ be come, all are shut up under sin. Thirdly, the special "advantage of the Jews was, that unto them this promise of God was committed," as the chosen covenant people. The Gentiles, groaning and lost under the universal burden and sentence of sin, were ignorant of the sure promise of a common salvation yet to be brought. While the Jews indulged in glowing and exclusive expectations of the Messiah who was gloriously to redeem them, the Gentiles were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." Fourthly, in the fulness of time — long after "the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen, had preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thy seed shall all nations be blessed" — "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, that the blessing promised to Abraham might come upon the Gentiles." It was the precise mission of Christ to realize and exemplify and publish to the whole world the fulfilment of the promise. The promise itself was, that men should be released from the under-world through the imputation of righteousness by grace, that is, through free forgiveness, and rise to heaven as accredited sons.

and heirs of God. This aim and purpose of Christ's coming were effected in his resurrection. But how did the Gentiles enter into belief and participation of the glad tidings? Thus, according to Paul: The death, descent, resurrection, and ascent of Jesus, and his residence in heaven in a spiritual form, divested him of his nationality. He was "then to be known no more after the flesh." He was no longer an earthly Jew, addressing Jews, but a heavenly spirit and son of God, a glorified likeness of the spirits of all who were adopted as sons of God, appealing to them all as joint heirs with himself of heaven. He has risen into universality, and is accessible to the soul of every one that believeth. "In him there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free." The experience resulting in a heart raised into fellowship with him in heaven is the inward seal assuring us that our faith is not vain. "Ye Gentiles, who formerly were afar off, are now made nigh by the blood of Christ; for he hath broken down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, namely, the law of commandments in ordinances, in order to make in himself of twain one new man. For through him we both have access by one spirit unto the Father. Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God." Circumcision was of the flesh, and the vain hope of salvation by it was confined to the Jews. Grace was of the spirit, and the revealed assurance of salvation by it was given to the Gentiles too, when Christ died to the nationalizing flesh, rose in the universalizing spirit, and from heaven impartially exhibited himself, through the preaching of the Gospel, to the appropriating faith of all.

Were there room in this article, we should further substantiate the foregoing positions by applying the general theory they contain to the explication of scores of individual texts, which it minutely fits and broadly unfolds, and which cannot upon any other view be sharply interpreted, nor indeed interpreted at all, upon any other view, without forced constructions, unwarranted by a thorough acquaintance with the mind of Paul and with the mind of his age. But we must be content with one or two such applications as specimens. The word "mys-



tery" often occurs in the letters of Paul. Its current meaning in his time was something concealed, into which one must be initiated in order to understand it. The Eleusinian Mysteries, for instance, were not necessarily any thing intrinsically dark and hard to be comprehended, but things hidden from public gaze, and only to be known by initiation into them. Paul uses the term in a similar way to denote the peculiar scheme of grace, which "had been kept secret from the beginning of the world," "hidden from ages and generations, but now made manifest." No one denies that Paul means by "this mystery" the very heart and essence of the Gospel, precisely that which distinguishes it from the law, and makes it a universal method of salvation, a wondrous system of grace. So much is irresistibly evident from the way and the connection in which he uses the term. Now he writes thus in explanation of the great mystery as it was dramatically revealed through Christ: "Who was manifested in the flesh [i. e. seen in the body during his life on earth], justified in the spirit [i. e. freed after death from the necessity of imprisonment in hades], seen of angels [i. e. in their fellowship after his resurrection], preached unto the Gentiles [i. e. after the gift of tongues on Pentecost day], believed on in the world [i. e. his Gospel widely accepted through the labors of his disciples], received up into glory [i. e. taken into heaven to the presence of God]." "The revelation of the mystery" means, then, we assert, the visible enactment and exhibition, through the resurrection of Christ, of God's free forgiveness of men, redeeming them from the hadean gloom to the heavenly glory. The word "glory" in the New Testament confessedly often signifies the illumination of heaven, the defined abode of God and his angels. Robinson collects, in his *Lexicon*, numerous examples, wherein he says it means "that state which is the portion of those who dwell with God in heaven." Now Paul repeatedly speaks of the calling of believers to glory as one of the chief blessings and new prerogatives of the Gospel. "Being justified by faith, we rejoice in hope of the glory of God." "Walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his glory." "We speak wisdom to the initiates, the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery, which before the world [the Jewish dispensation] God

ordained for our glory." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God: behold, I show you a mystery; we shall all be changed in a moment, and put on immortality." In the first chapter of the letter to the Colossians, Paul speaks of "the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye have heard in the Gospel"; also of "the inheritance of the saints in light"; then he says, "God would now make known among the Gentiles the mystery, which is, Christ among you, the hope of glory." In the light of what has gone before, how significant and how clear is this declaration! "All have sinned, and failed to attain unto the glory of God; but now, through the faith of Jesus Christ [through the dispensation brought to light by Christ], the righteousness of God [God's method of salvation] is unto all that believe." That is, by the law all were shut up in hades, but by grace they are now ransomed and to be received to heaven. The same thought or scheme is contained in that remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Galatians, where Paul says the free Isaac and the bond-woman Hagar were an allegory, teaching that there are two covenants, one by Abraham, the other by Moses. The Mosaic covenant of the law "answers to the Jerusalem which is on earth, and is in bondage with her children," and belongs only to the Jews. The Abrahamic covenant of promise answers to "the Jerusalem which is above, and is free, and is the mother of us all." In the former, we were "begotten unto bondage." In the latter, "Christ hath made us free." We will notice but one more text in passing; it is, of all the proof-texts of the doctrine of a substitutional expiation, the one which has ever been regarded as the very Achilles. And yet it can be made to support that doctrine only by the aid of arbitrary assumptions and mistranslations, while by its very terms it perfectly coincides with, nay, expressly declares, the theory which we have been advocating as the genuine interpretation of Paul. The Calvinistic commentators, in their treatment of this passage, have been guilty of a long-continued series of utter perversions and sophisms, affording the strongest example of the most glaring, inexcusable, and determined prejudice that ever came within our observation. The correct Greek reading of the text is justly rendered thus: "Whom God set

forth, a mercy-seat through the faith in his blood, to exhibit his righteousness through the remission of former sins by the forbearance of God." For rendering *ἰλαστήριον* "mercy-seat," the *usus loquendi* and the internal harmony of meaning are in our favor; and also the weight of the best Orthodox authorities, such as Theodoret, Origen, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Erasmus, Luther, and even Olshausen, to say nothing of the entire army of liberal critics, from Pelagius to De Wette. For rendering *διὰ* "through," no defence is needed; the only wonder is, how it ever could have been here translated "for." Now let two or three facts be noticed. First, the New Testament phrase "the faith of Christ," "the faith of Jesus," is very unfairly and unwarrantably made to mean an internal affection towards Christ, a belief of men in him. Its obvious, genuine meaning is the same as "the Gospel of Christ," or the religion of Christ, the system of grace which he brought.\* So, in the text now under our notice, "the faith which is in his blood" means the dispensation of pardon and justification, the system of faith which was confirmed and exemplified to us in his death and resurrection. Secondly, "the righteousness of God," which is here said to be "pointed out" by Christ's death, denotes simply, as no candid student can possibly fail to see, in Professor Stuart's words, "God's pardoning mercy," or "acquittal," or "gratuitous justification." "In which sense," he says truly, "it is almost always used in Paul's Epistles."† It signifies neither more nor less than God's method of salvation by freely forgiving sins and treating the sinner as if he were righteous; the method of salvation now carried into effect and revealed in the Gospel brought by Christ, and dramatically enacted in his passion and ascension. Thirdly, we ask attention to the fact, that the Calvinist, hard pressed by his unscriptural creed, interpolates a disjunctive conjunction in the opposing teeth of Paul's plain statement. Paul says, as the common version has it, God is "just, and [i. e. even] the justifier." The creed-bound commentators read it, "just and yet the justifier." We will now pre-

\* Robinson has gathered a great number of instances in his Lexicon, under the word "Faith," wherein it can only mean, as he says, "the system of Christian doctrines, the Gospel."

See Stuart's Romans, i. 17; iii. 25, 26, etc.



sent, in brief explanation, the true meaning of the whole passage according to Paul's own use of language. To establish a conviction of the correctness of our exposition, we only ask the ingenuous reader carefully to study the clauses of the Greek text, and recollect the foregoing data. "God has set Christ forth, to be to us a sure sign that we have been forgiven and redeemed through the faith that was proved by his triumph from death, the dispensation of grace inaugurated by him. Herein God has exhibited his method of saving sinners, which is, by the free remission of their sins through his kindness. Thus God is proved to be disposed to save, and to be saving, by the system of grace shown through Jesus, him that believeth." In consequence of sin, men were under sentence of condemnation to the under-world. In the fulness of time God fulfilled his ancient promise to Abraham. He freely justified men, that is, forgave them, redeemed them from their doom, and would soon open the sky for their abode with him. This whole scheme of redemption was carried out in Christ. That is to say, God proclaimed it to men, and asked their belief in it, by "setting forth Christ" to die, descend among the dead, rise thence, and ascend into heaven, as an exemplifying certification of the truth of the glad tidings.

Thirdly, Paul teaches that one aim of Christ's mission was to purify, animate, and exalt the moral characters of men, and rectify their conduct; to produce a subjective sanctification in them, and so prepare them for judgment, and fit them for heaven. The establishment of this proposition will conclude the present part of our subject. He writes that "Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." In various ways he often represents the fact that believers have been saved by grace through Christ as the very reason, the intensified motive, why they should scrupulously keep every tittle of the moral law, and abstain even from the appearance of evil, walking worthy of their high vocation. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared, teaching us that, denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world."

Bad men, "that obey not the Gospel of Christ," — such characters as "thieves, extortioners, drunkards, adulterers, — shall not inherit the kingdom of God." He proclaims in deliberate and unmistakable terms, "God will render to every man according to his deeds, wrath and tribulation to the evil-doer, honor and peace to the well-doer, whether Jew or Gentile." The conclusion to be drawn from these and other like declarations is clear, and absolutely unavoidable. It is that "every one, Jew and Gentile, shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and receive according to the deeds done in the body, for there is no respect of persons." And one part of Christ's mission was to exert a hallowing moral influence on men, to make them righteous, that they might pass the bar with acquittal. But the reader who recollects the class of texts adduced a little while since, will remember that an opposite conclusion was as unequivocally drawn from them. Then Paul said, "By faith ye are justified, without the deeds of the law." Now he says, "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." Is there a contradiction, then, in Paul? Only in appearance. Let us distinguish and explain. In the two quotations above, the Apostle is referring to two different things. First, he would say, by the faith of Christ, the free grace of God declared in the Gospel of Christ, ye are justified, gratuitously delivered from that necessity of imprisonment in hades which is the penalty of sin doomed upon the whole race from Adam, and from which no amount of personal virtue could avail to save men. Secondly, when he exclaims, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" his thought is of a spiritual qualification of character, indispensable for positive admission among the blest in heaven. That is to say, the impartial penalty of primeval sin consigned all men to hades. They could not by their own efforts escape thence and win heaven. That fated inability God has removed, and through Christ revealed its removal; but that one should actually obtain the offered and possible prize of heaven, personal purity, faith, obedience, holiness, are necessary. In Paul's conception of the scheme of Christian salvation, then,

there were two distinct parts; one, what God had done for all; the other, what each man was to do for himself. And the two great classes of seemingly hostile texts filling his Epistles, and which have puzzled so many readers, become clear and harmonious when we perceive and remember that by "righteousness" and its kindred terms he sometimes means the external and fulfilled method of redeeming men from the transmitted necessity of bondage in the under-world, and sometimes means the internal and contingent qualifications for actually realizing that redemption. In the former instance he refers to the objective mode of salvation, and the revelation of it in Christ. In the latter, he refers to the subjective fitness for that salvation, and certitude of it in the believer. So, too, the words "death" and "life," in Paul's writings, are generally charged, by a *constructio prægna*, with a double sense, one spiritual, individual, contingent; the other mechanical, common, absolute. Death, in its full Pauline force, includes inward guilt, condemnation, and misery, and outward descent into the under-world. Life, in its full Pauline force, includes inward rectitude, peace, and joy, and outward ascent into the upper-world. Holiness is necessary, "for without it no one can see the Lord"; yet, by itself, it can secure only inward life, it is ineffectual to win heaven. Grace, by itself, merely exempts from the fatality of the condemnation to hades; it offers eternal life in heaven only upon condition of "patient continuance in well-doing" by "faith, obedience to the truth, and sanctification of the spirit." But God's free grace and man's diligent fidelity combined, actually give the full fruition of blessedness in the heart, and of glory and immortality in the sky.

Such, as we have set forth in the foregoing three divisions, was Paul's view of the mission of Christ and the method of salvation. It has been only through patient living, by study and imagination, in the religion, philosophy, and circumstances of his age, that we have succeeded, to our own conviction at least, with vast pains in reproducing and constructing it. It has been now for these many centuries perverted and mutilated. Our toil has been with unprejudiced inspection to bring it forward in its genuine completeness, as it stood in the first century in Paul's own mind, and in the belief of his contemporaries.



The essential view, epitomized in a single sentence, is this. The independent grace of God has interfered, first, to save man from hades, and secondly, to enable him, by the coöperation of his own virtue, to get to heaven. Here are two separate things, means conjoined to effect the end, salvation. Now compare, in the light of this statement, the three great theological theories of Christendom. The common UNITARIAN, overlooking the objective justification, or offered redemption from the death-realm to the sky-home, which, whether it be a truth or an error, is surely there in the Epistles, makes the subjective sanctification all in all. The thorough CALVINIST, in his theory, scorns the subjective sanctification, which Paul insists on as a necessity for entering the kingdom of God, and, having perverted the objective justification from its real historic meaning, exaggerates it into the all in all. The ROMAN CATHOLIC holds that Christ simply removed the load of original sin and its entailed doom, and thus left each person to stand or fall by his own merits, in the communion of the Church. He also maintains that a part of Christ's office was to exert an influence for the moral improvement and consecration of human character. His error, as an interpreter of Paul's thought, is, that he too, like the Calvinist, attributes to Christ's death a vicarious efficacy, by suffering the pangs of mankind's guilt to buy their ransom from the inexorable justice of God, whereas the Apostle really represents Christ's redeeming mission as consisting simply in a dramatic exemplification of the Father's spontaneous love and purpose to pardon past offences, unbolt the gates of hades, and receive the worthy to heaven. Moreover, while Paul describes the heavenly salvation as an undeserved gift from the grace of God, the Catholic often seems to make it a prize to be earned, under the Christian dispensation, by good works which may fairly challenge that reward. However, we have little doubt that this apparent opposition is rather in the practical mode of exhortation than in any interior difference of dogma; for Paul himself makes personal salvation hinge on personal conditions, the province of grace being seen in the new extension to man of the opportunity and invitation to secure his own acceptance. And so the Roman Catholic exposition of Paul is much more

nearly correct than any other interpretation now prevalent. We should expect, *a priori*, that it would be, since that Church contains over two thirds of Christendom, and is by far the most intimately connected, by its scholars, members, and traditions, with the Apostolic age.

A prominent feature in the belief of Paul, and one deserving distinct notice, as necessarily involving a considerable part of the theory which we have attributed to him, is the supposition that Christ was the first person, clothed with humanity and experiencing death, admitted into heaven. Of all the hosts who had lived and died, every soul had gone down into the dusky and dream-like under-world. There they all were held in durance, waiting for the Great Deliverer. In the splendors of the realm over the sky, God and his angels dwelt alone. That we do not err in ascribing this belief to Paul, we might summon the whole body of the Fathers to testify in almost unbroken phalanx, from old Polycarp to St. Bernard. The entire Roman, Greek, and English Churches still maintain the same dogma. But the Apostle's own very plain words will be sufficient for our purpose. "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from among the dead." "Now is Christ risen from among the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept." "He is the beginning, the first-born from among the dead, that among all he might have the pre-eminence." "God raised Christ from among the dead, and set him at his own right hand\* in the heavenly places, far above every principality, and power, and might, and dominion." The last words refer to different orders of spirits, supposed by the Jews to people the aerial region below the heaven of God. "God hath" (already in our anticipating faith) "raised us up together with Christ, and made us sit in heavenly places with him." These testimonies are enough to show that Paul believed Jesus to have been raised up to the abode of God, the first man ever exalted thither, and that this was done as a pledge and illustration of the same occurrence

---

\* Griesbach argues at length, and shows unanswerably, that this passage cannot bear a moral interpretation, but necessarily has a physical and local sense. See Griesbachii Opuscula Academica, ed. Gabler, Vol. II. pp. 145-149.

awaiting those that believe. "If we be dead with Christ, we believe we shall also live with him." And the Apostle teaches, that we are not only connected with Christ's resurrection by the outward order and sequence of events, but also by an inward gift of the spirit. He says, that to every obedient believer is given an experimental "knowledge of the power of the resurrection of Christ," which is the seal of God within him, the pledge of his own celestial destination. "After that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." The office of this gift of the spirit is to awaken in the believing Christian a vivid realization of the things in store for him, and a perfect conviction that he shall yet possess them in the unclouded presence of God, beyond the canopy of azure and the stars. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But he hath revealed them unto us, for we have received his spirit that we might know them." "The spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children and heirs of God, even joint heirs with Christ, that we may be glorified [i. e. advanced into heaven] with him."

We will leave this topic with a brief paraphrase of the celebrated passage in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. "Not only do the generality of mankind groan in pain in this decaying state, under the bondage of perishable elements, travailing for emancipation from the flesh into the liberty of the heavenly glory appointed for the sons and heirs of God, but even we, who have the first fruits of the spirit, [i. e. the assurance springing from the resurrection of Christ,] we too wait, painfully longing for the adoption, that is, our redemption from the body." By longing for the adoption, or filiation, is meant, impatient desire to be received into heaven as children, to the enjoyment of the privileges of their Father's house. "God predetermined that those called should be conformed to the image of his Son [i. e. should pass through the same course with Christ and reach the heavenly goal], that he might be the first-born among many brethren." To the securing of this end, "whom he called, them also he justified [i. e. ransomed



from hades\*]; and whom he justified, them he also glorified [i. e. advanced to the glory of heaven]."

It must be evident to every one not blinded by prejudice, that Paul looked for the speedy second-coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven, with angels, and power, and glory. He expected that at that time the wicked and all enemies would be overthrown and punished, the dead would be raised, and the living would be changed, and all that were Christ's would be translated to heaven.† "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the Gospel of Christ." "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, at the last trump." "We who are alive and remain until the coming of the Lord shall not anticipate those that are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God;‡ and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so we shall always be with the Lord. Brethren, you need not that I should specify the time to you, for yourselves are perfectly aware that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." "The time is short." "I pray God your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." "At his appearing he shall judge the living and the dead." "The Lord is at hand." The author of these sentences undeniably looked daily for the great advent. Than Paul, indeed,

---

\* That "justify" often means, in Paul's usage, to absolve from hades, we have concluded from a direct study of his doctrines and language. We find that Bretschneider gives it the same definition in his *Lexicon of the New Testament*. See *δικαιόω*.

† "Every one shall rise in his own division" of the great army of the dead: "Christ, the first-fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's, at his coming."

‡ Rabbi Akiba says, in the Talmud: "God shall take and blow a trumpet, a thousand godlike yards in length, whose echo shall sound from end to end of the world. At the first blast the earth shall tremble. At the second, the dust shall part. At the third, the bones shall come together. At the fourth, the members shall grow warm. At the fifth, they shall be crowned with the head. At the sixth, the soul shall reënter the body. And at the seventh, they shall stand erect." See Corrodi's *Geschichte Chiliasmus*, Band erst, Seite 355.

no one more earnestly believed himself, or did more to strengthen in others that belief in the speedy return of Christ, which thrilled all early Christendom with hope and dread, and kept the disciples day and night on the stretch and start of expectation to hear the awful blast of the judgment trump, and to see the glorious vision of the Son of God descending amidst a convoy of angels.

The resurrection which Paul thought would attend the second coming of Christ, was the rising of the summoned spirits of the deceased from their rest in the under-world. Most certainly it was not the restoration of their decomposed bodies from their graves, although that incredible surmise has been generally entertained. He says, while answering the question, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but naked grain; God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him." The comparison is, that so the naked soul is sown in the under-world, and God, when he raiseth it, giveth it a fitting body. He does not hesitate to call the man who expects the restoration of the same body that was buried, "a fool." His whole argument is explicitly against that idea. "There are bodies celestial, as well as bodies terrestrial; the first man was of the earth, earthy; the second man was the Lord from heaven; and as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly; for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." In view of these declarations, it is truly astonishing that any one can suppose that Paul believed in the resurrection of these present bodies and their transference into heaven. "In this tabernacle we groan, being burdened," and "Who shall deliver me from this body of death!" he cries. If ever there was a man whose goading experience, keen intellectual energies, and moral sensibilities, made him weary of this slow, gross body, and passionately to long for a more corresponding, swift, and pure investiture, it was Paul. And in his theory of "the glorious body of Christ, according to which our vile body shall be changed," he relieved his impatience and fed his desire. What his conception of that body was, definitely, we cannot tell, but doubtless it was the idea of a vehicle adapted to his mounting and ardent soul, and in many

particulars very unlike this present groaning load of clay.

The Epistles of Paul contain no clear allusion to the notion of a Millennium,—a thousand years' reign of Christ with his saints on the earth after his second advent; on the contrary, in many places, particularly in the fourth chapter of his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, he says, that the Lord and them that are his will directly repossess into heaven after the consummation of his descent from heaven and their resurrection from the dead. But the declaration, "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet," taken with its context, is thought by Bertholdt, Billroth, De Wette, and others, to imply that Christ would establish a millennial kingdom on earth, and reign in it engaged in vanquishing all hostile forces. Against this exegesis we have to say, first, that, so far as that goes, the vast preponderance of critical authorities is opposed to it. Secondly, if this conquest were to be secured on earth, there is nothing to show that it need occupy much time; one year might answer for it, as well as a thousand. There is nothing here to show that Paul means just what the Rabbins taught. Thirdly, even if Paul supposed a considerable period must elapse before "all enemies" would be subdued, during which period Christ must reign, it does not follow that he believed that reign would be on earth; it might be in heaven. The "enemies" referred to are, in part at least, the wicked spirits occupying the regions of the upper air; for he specifies these "principalities, authorities, and powers."\* And the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents God as saying to Jesus, "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Fourthly, it seems certain that, if in the Apostle's thought a thousand years were interpolated between Christ's second coming and the delivering up of his mediatorial sceptre to God, he would have said so, at least somewhere in his writings. He would naturally have dwelt upon it a

---

\* The apocryphal "Ascension of Isaiah," already spoken of, gives a detailed description of the upper air as occupied by Satan and his angels, among whom fighting and evil deeds rage; but Christ in his ascent conquers and spoils them all, and shows himself a victor ever brightening as he rises successively through the whole seven heavens to the feet of God. *Ascensio Vatis Isaia*, Cap. VI.—X.



little, as the Chiliasts did so much. Instead of that, he repeatedly contradicts it. Upon the whole, then, with Ruckert, we cannot see any reason for not supposing that, according to Paul, "the end" was immediately to succeed "the coming," as *εἰτα* would properly indicate. The doctrine of a long earthly reign of Christ is not deduced *from* this passage, by candid interpretation, because it must be inferred there, but foisted *into* it, by Rabbinical information, because it may be introduced there.

Paul distinctly teaches that the believers who died before the second coming of the Saviour would remain in the under-world until that event, when they and the transformed living should ascend "together with the Lord." All the relevant expressions in his Epistles, save two, are obviously in harmony with this conception of a temporary subterranean sojourn, waiting for the appearance of Jesus from heaven to usher in the resurrection. But in the fifth chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians he writes, "Abiding in the body we are absent from the Lord." It is usually inferred from these words, and those which follow them, that the Apostle expected, whenever he died, to be instantly with Christ. Certainly they do mean pretty nearly that, but then they mean it in connection with the second advent, and the accompanying circumstances and events; for Paul believed that many of the disciples, possibly himself, would live until Christ's coming. All through these two chapters, the fourth and fifth, it is obvious, from the marked use of the terms "we" and "you," and from other considerations, that "we" here refers solely to the writer, the individual Paul. It is the plural of accommodation used by common custom and consent. Now in the form of a slight paraphrase we may unfold the genuine meaning of the passage in hand. "In this body I am afflicted: not that I would merely be released from it, for then I should be a naked spirit. But I earnestly desire, unclothing myself of this earthly body, at the same time to clothe myself with my heavenly body, that I may lose all my mortal part and its woes in the full experience of heaven's eternal life. God has determined that this result shall come to me sooner or later, and has given me a pledge of it in the witnessing spirit. But it cannot

happen so long as I tarry in the flesh, the Lord delaying his appearance. Having the infallible earnest of the spirit, I do not dread the change, but desire to hasten it. Confident of acceptance in that day at the judgment-seat of Christ, before which we must all then stand, I long for the crisis, when, divested of this body and invested with the immortal form wrought for me by God, I shall be with the Lord. Still, knowing the terror which shall environ the Lord at his coming to judgment, I plead with men to be prepared." Who ever carefully examines the whole connected passage, from iv. 6 to v. 16, we think, will see that the above paraphrase truly exposes its meaning.

The other text alluded to as an apparent exception to the doctrine of a residence in the lower land of ghosts intervening between death and the ascension, occurs in the Epistle to the Philippians. "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better; but that I should abide in the flesh is more needful for you." There are three possible ways of regarding this passage. First, we may suppose that Paul, seeing the advent of the Lord postponed longer and longer, changed his idea of the intermediate state of deceased Christians, and thought they would spend that period of waiting in heaven, not in hades. Neander advocates this view. But there is little to sustain it, and it is loaded with fatal difficulties. A change of faith so important and bright in its view as this must have seemed under the circumstances, would have been more clearly and fully stated. Attention would have been earnestly invited to so great a favor and comfort; exultation and gratitude would have been expressed over so unheard-of a boon. Moreover, what had occurred to effect the alleged new belief? The unexpected delay of Christ's coming might make the Apostle wish that his departed friends were tarrying above the sky, instead of beneath the sepulchre, but it could furnish no ground to warrant a sudden faith in that wish as a fulfilled fact. Besides, the truth is, that Paul never ceased, even to the last, to expect the speedy arrival of the Lord, and to regard the interval as a comparative trifle. In this very Epistle he says, "The Lord is at hand; be careful for nothing." Secondly, we may im-

agine that he expected himself, as a divinely chosen and especially favored servant, to go to Christ in heaven as soon as he died, if that should happen before the Lord's appearance, while the great multitude of believers would abide in the under-world until the general resurrection. The death he was in peril of, and is refering to, was that of martyrdom for the Gospel, from the hands of Nero. And many of the Fathers maintained, that in the case of every worthy Christian martyr there was an exception to the general doom, and that he was permitted to enter heaven at once. Still, to argue such a thought in the text before us requires an hypothesis far-fetched, and unsupported by one clear declaration of the Apostle himself. Thirdly, we may assume — and it seems to us by far the least encumbered and the most plausible of any theory that meets the case — that Paul believed there would be vouchsafed to the faithful Christian during his transient abode in the under-world a more intimate and blessed spiritual fellowship with his Master than he could experience while in the flesh. "For I am persuaded that neither death [separation from the body] nor depth [the under-world] shall be able to separate us from God's love which he has manifested through Christ." He may refer, therefore, by his hopes of being straight-way with Christ on leaving the body, to a spiritual communion with him in the disembodied state below, and not to his physical presence in the supernal realm, the latter not being attainable previous to the resurrection. Indeed, a little farther on in this same Epistle he plainly shows that he did not anticipate being received to heaven till after the second coming of Christ. He says, "We look for the Saviour from heaven, who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like unto his own glorious body." This change is the preliminary preparation to ascent to heaven, which change he repeatedly represents as indispensable.

What Paul believed would be the course and fate of things on earth after the final consummation of Christ's mission is a matter of inference from his brief and partial hints. The most probable and consistent view which can be constructed from those hints is this. He thought all mankind would become reconciled and obedient to God; and death, losing its punitive character, become



what it was originally intended to be, the mere change of the earthly for a heavenly body preparatory to a direct ascension. "Then shall the Son himself be subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Then placid virtues and innocent joys should fill the world, and human life be what it was in Eden ere guilt forbade angelic visitants and converse with heaven.\* "So when" — without a previous descent into hades, as the whole context proves — "this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying which is written: 'Death shall be swallowed up in victory. O Death, thou last enemy, where is thy sting! O Hades, thou gloomy prison, where is thy victory!'" The exposition just offered is confirmed by its striking, entire adaptedness to the whole Pauline scheme. It is also the interpretation given by the earliest Fathers, and by the Church in general until now. This idea of men being changed and rising into heaven without at all entering the disembodied state below, was evidently in the mind of Milton when he wrote the following lines: —

"And from these corporeal nutriments, perhaps,  
Your bodies may at last turn all to spirit,  
And, winged, ascend ethereal, — may, at choice,  
Here, or in heavenly paradise, dwell."

It now remains to see what Paul thought was to be the final portion of the hardened and persevering sinner. One class of passages in his writings, if taken by themselves, would lead us to believe that on that point he had no fixed convictions in regard to particulars, but, thinking these beyond the present reach of reason, contented himself with the general assurance that all such persons would meet their just deserts, and there left the subject in obscurity. "God will render to every man, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek, according to his deeds." "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." "At the judgment-seat of Christ

---

\* Neander thinks Paul's idea was, that "the perfected kingdom of God would then blend itself harmoniously throughout his unbounded dominions." We believe his apprehension is correct. This globe would become a part of the general Paradise, an anteroom or a lower story to the Temple of the Universe.

every one shall receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." From these and a few kindred texts we might infer that the author, aware that he "knew but in part," simply held the belief, — without attempting to pry into special methods, details, and results, — that at the time of the judgment all should have exact justice. He may, however, have unfolded in his preaching minutiae of faith not explained in his Letters.

A second class of passages in the Epistles of Paul would naturally cause the common reader to conclude, that he imagined the unregenerate, those unfit for the presence of God, were to be annihilated when Christ, after his second coming, should return to heaven with his saints. "Those who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of Christ, shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence and glory of the Lord when he shall come." "The end of the enemies of the cross of Christ is destruction." "The vessels of wrath fitted for destruction." "As many as have sinned without law shall perish without law." But it is to be observed that the word here rendered "destruction" need not signify annihilation. It often, even in Paul's Epistles, plainly means severe punishment, dreadful misery, moral ruin and retribution. For example, "foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition," "piercing them through with many sorrows." It may, or may not, have that sense in the instances above cited. Their meaning is intrinsically uncertain; we must bring other passages and distinct considerations to aid our interpretation.

From a third selection of texts in Paul's Epistles, it is not strange that some persons have deduced the doctrine of unconditional and universal salvation. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." But the genuine explanation of this sentence we are constrained to believe is as follows: "As, following after the example of Adam, all souls descend below, so, following after Christ, all shall be raised up"; that is, at the judgment, after which event some may be taken to heaven, others banished into hades again. "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe." This means that all men have

been saved now from the unconditional sentence to hades brought on them by the first sin, but not all know the glad tidings; those that do receive them into believing hearts are already exulting over their deliverance and their hopes of heaven. All are objectively saved from the unavoidable and universal necessity of hadean imprisonment; the obedient believers are also subjectively saved from the contingent and personal risk of incurring that doom. "God hath shut them all up together in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." "All" here means both Jews and Gentiles, and the reference is to the universal annulment of the universal fatality, and the impartial offer of heaven to every one who sanctifies the truth in his heart. In some cases the word "all" is used with rhetorical looseness, not with logical rigidity, and denotes merely all Christians. Ruckert shows this well in his commentary on the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians. In other instances the universality, which is indeed plainly there, applies to the removal from the race of the inherited doom, while a conditionality is unquestionably implied as to the actual salvation of each person. We say Paul does constantly represent personal salvation as depending on conditions, as beset by perils, and to be earnestly striven for. "Lest that by any means I myself should be a castaway." "Deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." "Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of the Lord." "To them that are saved we are a savor of life unto life; to them that perish, a savor of death unto death." "Charge them that are rich that they be humble and do good, laying up in store a good foundation, that they may lay hold on eternal life." It is clear from these and many similar passages of Paul, that he did not believe in the unconditional salvation, the positive mechanical salvation, of all individuals, but held personal salvation to be a contingent problem, to be worked out, through the permitting grace of God, by Christian faith, works, and character. How plainly this is contained, too, in his doctrine of "a resurrection of the just and the unjust," and a day of judgment, from whose august tribunal Christ is to pronounce sentence according to each man's deeds! At the



same time, the undeniable fact deserves particular remembrance, that he says, and apparently knows, nothing whatever of a hell, in the now received acceptation of that term,—a prison-house of fiery tortures. He assigns the realm of Satan and the evil spirits to the air, the vexed region between earth and heaven, according to the demonology of his age and country.

Finally, there is a fourth class of passages, from which we might infer that the Apostle's faith merely excluded the reprobate from participating in the ascent with Christ, just as some of the Pharisees excluded the Gentiles from their resurrection, and there left the subject in darkness. "They that are Christ's," "the dead in Christ, shall rise." "No sensualist, extortioner, idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." "There is laid up a crown of righteousness, which the Lord shall give in that day to all them that love his appearing." In all these and many other cases, there is a marked omission of any reference to the ultimate positive disposal of the wicked. Still, against the supposition of his holding the doctrine, that all except good Christians would be left below eternally, we have his repeated explicit avowals: "I have hope towards God, that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust." "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ." These last statements, however, prove only that Paul thought the bad as well as the good would be raised up and judged; they are not inconsistent with the belief, that the condemned would afterwards either be annihilated or remanded everlastingly to the under-world. This very belief, we think, is contained in that remarkable passage, where Paul writes to the Philippians, that he strives "if by any means he may attain unto the resurrection." Now the common resurrection of the dead for judgment needed not to be striven for; it would occur to all unconditionally. But there is another resurrection, or another part remaining to complete the resurrection, namely, after the judgment, a rising of the accepted to heaven. All shall rise from hades upon the earth to judgment. This Paul calls simply the resurrection, *ἀνάστασις*. After the judgment, the accepted shall rise to heaven. This Paul calls, with distinctive emphasis, *ἐξανάστασις*, the preëminent or com-

plete resurrection; the prefix being used as an intensive. This is what the Apostle considers uncertain, and labors to secure, "stretching forwards and pressing towards the goal for the prize of that call upwards, *ἀνω*, (that invitation to heaven,) which God has extended through Christ." Those who are condemned at the judgment can have no part in this completion of the resurrection, cannot enter the heavenly kingdom, but must be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence and glory of the Lord"; that is, as we suppose is signified, be thrust into the under-world for evermore.

For want of space, we have been forced to omit an exposition of the Pauline doctrine of the natural rank and proper or delegated offices of Christ in the universe; also to pass by any examination of the validity of the doubts and arguments brought against the genuineness of the lesser Epistles ascribed to Paul. We must likewise refrain from critical remarks on the character and evidences of the doctrines we have deduced from his writings. In closing, we can only sum up in brief array the leading conceptions in his view of the last things. Let us say, however, that our interpretation and construction have this strong confirmation for their accuracy: they are arrived at from the stand-point of the life of Paul in the first century, not from the stand-point of the experience of the cultivated Christian in the nineteenth century. First, there is a world of immortal light and bliss over the sky, the exclusive abode of God and the angels from of old; also a dreary world of darkness and repose under the earth, the abode of all departed human spirits. Secondly, death was originally meant to lead souls into heaven, clothed in new and divine bodies, immediately on the fall of the present tabernacle; but sin broke that plan, and doomed them to pass disembodied into hades. Third, the Mosaic dispensation of law could not deliver men from that sentence, but God had promised Abraham that through one of his posterity they should be delivered. To fulfil that promise Christ came. He illustrated God's unpurchased love and forgiveness, and determination to restore the original plan as if men had never sinned. Christ effected this aim, this proclamation of the good tidings, in conjunction with his teachings, by dying, descending into hades as if

the doom of a sinful man were upon him also, subduing the powers of that prison-house, rising again, and ascending into heaven, the first one ever admitted there from among the dead, thus exemplifying the fulfilled "expectation of the creature that was groaning and travailing in pain" to be born into the freedom of the heavenly glory of the sons of God. Fourthly, "justification by faith," therefore, simply means the redemption from hades by the dispensation of free grace which is proclaimed in the Gospel. Fifthly, every sanctified believer receives a pledge or earnest of the spirit sealing him as God's, and assuring him of acceptance with Christ and of advance to heaven. For the perfection of this inward witness every one must strive. Sixthly, Christ was speedily to come a second time, come in glory and power irresistible, to consummate his mission, raise the dead, judge the world, establish a new order of things, and return into heaven with his chosen ones. Seventhly, the stubbornly wicked portion of mankind would be returned eternally into the under-world. Eighthly, after the judgment, the subterranean realm of death would be shut up, no more souls going into it, but all men at their dissolution being instantly invested with spiritual bodies and ascending to the glory of the Lord. Finally, Jesus, having put down all enemies, and fully restored the primeval paradise, shall yield up his mediatorial throne, and God the Father be all in all.

The preparatory rudiments of this system of the last things existed in the belief of the age, and it was itself composed by the union of a theoretic interpretation of the life of Christ, and of the connected phenomena succeeding his death, with the elements of Pharisaic Judaism, all mingled in the crucible of the soul of Paul and fused by the fires of his experience. It perfectly illustrates a great number of the most puzzling passages in the New Testament, without the necessity of recourse to the unnatural, incredible, unwarranted dogmas associated with them by the unique, isolated peculiarities of Calvinism.

W. R. A.



## ART. IV.—PITMAN'S PHONETIC ALPHABETS.\*

It can hardly have escaped the observation of our readers, that there have been great efforts made within a few years past to introduce Phonetics into the common schools, and that these attempts have met with a silent, but strong opposition, on the part of many of the wisest friends of education. We have, therefore, thought that a brief explanation of the subject might be acceptable and useful. Without further apology, therefore, let us enter at once upon the matter.

The Phonetic mode of writing is that in which each elementary sound of a language is invariably represented by the same character, and each character in the alphabet is used to represent only one sound. The first and most obvious advantage of such an alphabet is, that it reduces the labor of learning to read and write to the mere labor of learning the alphabet. He that knows his alphabet for phonetic reading can read any word at first sight, and write any word which he has heard pronounced.

It would be useless, in a brief explanatory article like the present, to attempt to show how phonetic writing was first introduced into the world, and how in every modern language there have gradually been introduced departures from strict phonetic spelling. It is enough to say, that in no language has the departure from phonetic spelling been greater than in the English, and that this naturally arises from the fact, that no language is formed from a greater variety of elements, or has undergone more rapid changes. So great is this departure in English, that it is almost impossible for us to represent a sound in such a way as to make it absolutely certain that other men will understand us; and there are very few proper names whose spelling will convey a just idea of their pronunciation to those that have never heard the names.

In consequence of this lack of phonetic powers in the English alphabet, it is necessary to teach a child, or a foreigner, not only the sounds of the letters, but also the

---

\* *First Phonetic Reader.* Fourth Edition. Boston: Otis Clapp. 1852. 12mo. pp. 72.

particular pronunciation of almost every new word which he sees written. The letter *a* represents at least seven distinct sounds, besides being sometimes silent; and no rules have been devised by which the learner can tell which sound he is to give in a word that he encounters for the first time. In like manner, *ough* has seven different sounds; and many letters and combinations of letters have six, five, and four sounds. This renders it extremely difficult to learn the pronunciation of the printed language. The difficulty of learning to write it is further aggravated by the variety of ways in which one sound is represented. The sound of *a* in *ape*, for example, is written in more than thirty different ways; and however familiar a word containing that sound is to the ear of a learner, he cannot write it until he has seen it written.

The result is, that one third of the population of England cannot read, and one half the population are unable to write.

To remedy these evils of English orthography, it has often been proposed to revise the alphabet and add new letters. There seems to be no more reason why the English should be confined to twenty-six letters, than there was why the Greeks should have been confined to the sixteen letters of Phœnicia. Our language cannot be written phonetically with less than thirty-six letters, and indeed we must then have some other characters to indicate our four diphthongs, so that it is not convenient to write English phonetically with less than forty letters.

No attempt to reform our alphabet has ever had so much success as that of Messrs. Pitman and Ellis, whose alphabet has been in use only five or six years, and has nevertheless already been the means of giving thousands of adult Englishmen and Irishmen the power of reading and writing the English language. Their success probably arises from two very distinct causes.

These gentlemen, taking the hint, as they say, from the writings of our own Franklin, have invented three new alphabets; namely, the Phonotype, the Phonetic Longhand, and the Phonetic Shorthand.

The Phonotypic Alphabet takes the common alphabet, with the exception of *k*, *q*, and *x*, and adds seventeen new letters. The principle on which it is formed,

and which undoubtedly is one secret of its success, is to make a word printed in phonotype look as much as possible like the same word printed in common type. So nearly is this done, that a person who can read either type fluently can learn to read the other with scarcely appreciable labor.

The Phonetic Longhand is simply phonotype adapted to ordinary penmanship, and differs from common writing in precisely the same way that phonotype differs from common printing.

The Phonetic Shorthand, commonly called Phonography, is an invention of a much higher order. It consists of an alphabet simplified as much as possible in the form of the letters, so as to take the least possible time in writing. At the same time a perfect legibility is maintained, so that the phonographic reporter can rise at the close of an orator's extemporaneous speech, and read it aloud from a copy which he has taken verbatim as it was delivered. Public speakers utter from eighty to one hundred and sixty words in a minute. It is a common thing for phonographers to write one hundred words in a minute, and there are those who can write over two hundred. In common writing, thirty words a minute is considered rapid execution. How rapidly stenographers, in older systems, could write, we do not remember to have heard; but we know that phonography is rapidly driving stenography out of use. And we have no doubt that this brilliant career of phonography is one great cause of the attention which has been given to the phonotype which came afterwards from the same inventor. Those who have paid any attention to phonography are usually enthusiastic in its praises, and predict that it will banish the present written (not the printed) alphabet, just as surely as the neat forms of the present letters have banished the clumsy forms that preceded them back to the Egyptian hieroglyphic.

Nevertheless, we suppose that some of our readers may never see any written phonography, and that they may be interested to know what it is like. We will endeavor to describe it, but must premise by saying that the sounds of the language are divided by Mr. Pitman as follows: six long vowels; six short vowels; four diphthongs; two ambiguous letters, *y*, *w*; the



breathing, *h*; and twenty-one consonants. To represent these he uses twenty-four consonant signs, each of which consists of a single stroke of the pen; twelve being hair strokes and twelve heavy. The twelve may be formed by making these three, ( , | , ), horizontal, or by an inclination of them to the right or the left. In writing a word, the consonants are first written without raising the pen, and the vowels and diphthongs are afterward added by dots and short dashes. Thus, -( is *oath*; )- is *so*; and the like.

The most obvious use of phonography is in reporting debates and lectures, and in preparing notes for sermons, lectures, or speeches. Its usefulness in this latter respect does not consist wholly in the saving of time, but partly in the increase of mental vivacity which arises from so rapid a mode of committing thoughts to paper. In this it resembles, in a feeble degree, the stimulus of extemporaneous speech. We are, however, inclined to believe that the greatest advantage of phonography, to the world at large, will arise from the increase of friendly correspondence, strengthening social ties, and binding sundered families together. Business letters are short, and the time consumed in writing them bears little proportion to their value. But in social correspondence the time used in writing a long conversational letter is a serious tax, and operates as a great restraint upon friendly intercommunications. Nor do we see any reason why phonography should not come into general use. Its brilliant success in the hands of reporters will be constantly drawing attention to it, and the ease of learning to use it will allure students. From our own experience we would indorse the statement made in advertisements, that "its principles may be mastered in a few hours; and one hour's daily practice for one month will enable the student to use it with certainty and freedom, while the same amount of practice continued for six months or a year will enable any one to take verbatim reports of sermons, lectures, &c."

Let us return to phonotype, with which our discussion started, and review some of the arguments which are brought for and against its introduction into our common schools.

The extent of the efforts made to introduce phonetics

is, at present, simply this : to teach the phonetic alphabet first, and confine the child to phonetic books about six months or a year; afterward, to use the phonetic type as an enunciatory drill, but also to teach the child to read and spell in common type. The only additional use of phonotype which we would wish, is occasionally to indicate the pronunciation of a foreign word, or difficult proper name; to use it, that is, as a pronouncing key. The reasons for introducing phonetics are as follows.

1. The ease of teaching. Repeated experiments have shown that a class of children, of average capacity, under seven years of age, receiving instruction during half an hour a day, will learn to read phonotype fluently in less than six months; and that the same instruction continued three months longer enables them to read and spell common print as well as the average of classes, taught in the common way, do at the age of fourteen years. The causes of this rapid progress are manifold. During the first six months the phonetic character of the type is the principal aid; but a scarcely less important circumstance is, that the child is not taught the names of the letters, but only their powers. Take, for example, the word *cup*, which is spelled alike in the two prints. The child taught in the common way reads the letters *c u p*; see *you pea*; and no ingenuity can make *see you pea* sound like *cup*. The child taught by phonetics pronounces *c* by a simple whisper on the back part of the palate, such as is heard at the end of the words *look, tack, bake, poke*. He pronounces *u* as he would the word *up*, if he held his lips apart so that he could not pronounce the *p*. And he pronounces *p* by a simple whisper from the lips, as heard in the end of the words *hop, hope, soap*. Now these three sounds being pronounced without any interval or pause between them, infallibly produce the word *cup*. A third reason of the rapid progress of the child is, that there is no nonsense in the Phonetic Reader. He sees only words which have meaning, no disheartening *a, b, ab*; and *b, u, bu*.

At the end of six months he passes to common reading, and the passage from one type to the other is effected by a few lessons, about eighty in number, in which the principal anomalies of common spelling are classified and explained.

2. The effect of phonetics on enunciation is very remarkable. Schools in which provincialism of pronunciation was a striking defect, have been vastly benefited by simply reading and spelling from this type.

3. The moral effect on the child is excellent. By removing the tediousness and bewildering contradictions which made children, taught in the old way, careless and indifferent, and by substituting a method of truthful simplicity, it gives an intellectual honesty and industry which is likely to affect very favorably their whole future course.

4. It offers the readiest means of teaching our Irish population to read and write, and of thus bringing them under American influences. We know of instances in which children, taught phonetics in the public schools, are teaching their parents to read.

5. It furnishes the easiest means of teaching our German, Hungarian, Norwegian, French, and Spanish citizens how to read and pronounce the English tongue. The labor of a foreigner in learning to speak our language is almost beyond the conception of those who were born under its sounds.

Other advantages might perhaps be enumerated, but these are sufficient, we think, to command the attention of all men. The objections brought against phonetics are:—

1. That they will render the mass of our literature obsolete. This objection implies that they will supersede common printing. But the present endeavor is simply to use them as an introduction to common print. Yet if they came into general use and banished common type, they would not make our present books obsolete, because a few hours' attention of an adult, familiar with phonetic reading, would enable him to read common type.

2. That they would obscure etymologies. This again implies the ultimate prevalence of phonotype, a result for which we are not striving. But even if phonotype should prevail, it would reveal as many etymologies as it would conceal; and the concealed ones could be readily shown again by reference to the present type.

3. That they give the child the trouble of learning an alphabet which he afterwards throws away. To which



it is very conclusively answered, that this trouble is a great saving of trouble, as we have shown above. The objector then changes his ground, and takes precisely the opposite stand.

4. That this saving of labor is of no value, as the time of a child under seven is of no consequence, and that he might as well be puzzling over the alphabet as doing any thing else. Nay, some have gone so far as to say, that these difficulties of orthography are an excellent mental discipline for the young mind. This objection to phonetics is the most astounding of all. All the psychological investigations of the race have shown the importance of early education. The mental habits of each hour of life are somewhat dependent on those of the preceding hour; and it is therefore impossible to state a time in an infant's life when its education is a matter of indifference. Of course we are not advocating an early education of powers which are not developed until a late period. But the power to hear is one of the first powers displayed, and the analysis of sounds is therefore a proper study for the youngest child; and the false analysis given by common spelling is a serious detriment to the child's powers of observation, powers of analysis, and sense of truth and fitness. As for a mental discipline in mastering a cumbrous and artificial orthography, it is better attained in copying simple drawings or exercising in the Chinese geometrical puzzles. Nay, the child would do better to play in the open air, observe nature, and gain physical strength, during the time which could be saved by means of the phonetic alphabet, than to be taught in the common way.

5. That the enunciatory drill can be obtained, and is obtained, by other means. This is granted; but those other means are very much more difficult to apply, and cannot therefore, in usual cases, be so efficacious. Moreover, this does not, at most, amount to an objection, but only to the denial of one of the reasons for introducing phonotype. And we may add, that other modes amount only to a partial remedy, because they are not applied until bad habits have been formed; whereas the teaching of the phonetic alphabet at the beginning of all learning will prevent the formation of any habit of defective articulation.

6. That the phonetic alphabet does not represent all the sounds of the language, and that changes and additions will therefore become necessary, introducing again, hereafter, the same strife as at present. To which it is well replied, that a speaker who reduced all his words to the Procrustean level of Pitman's forty letters, would not differ from standard usage more than a Philadelphian differs from a Bostonian. And if public usage should hereafter demand new vowel-signs for certain words, they can easily be adopted from the complete alphabet which is introduced into the higher reading-books for the printing of foreign phrases and proper names.

7. Finally, it is said to the phonotype, in the words of Tulkington, "I tell you I do not like the company you keep." Phonetic books are found lying on the same counter with the writings of new church men, homœopaths, and phrenologists, nay, even of mesmerists, biologists, and spiritual mediums. Phonetic newspapers have articles in them of the ultra reform school, and contain even editorials in eulogy of that notorious seer who traversed the region between Mars and Jupiter, and found but four asteroids, where the telescope shows twenty-three.

And this, we suspect, is in many minds the weightiest objection of all. Phonotypy and phonography claim to be popular reforms, and are therefore advocated by those who are intent, at any rate, on turning the world upside down. But ought this to be a real objection to the system? The phonetic readers prepared for schools are, as far as we have examined, not only free from taint of radicalism, but would be, if printed in common type, school-readers of the very highest style of excellence. It seems to us that Messrs. Pitman and Ellis have, in their phonographic and phonetic alphabets, given a valuable aid to all teachers of children, and to all teachers of men; and that the final effect of their inventions upon the literature and morals of all that speak the English tongue, will be a happy one.

T. H.

---

## ART. V. — LIFE AND WRITINGS OF DR. CHALMERS.\*

AN author is apt to put so much of himself into his books, as to attach comparatively little freshness of interest to his biography. We read with avidity the correspondence and posthumous memorials of Scott, or Southey, or Wordsworth, not in order to augment our impression of the man's genius, but because the works published in his lifetime have awakened a minute and fond curiosity as to all, however trivial, that he wrote, said, or did. Not so with Chalmers. We have taken it for granted that he was a very great man, but how or why it was impossible to determine from his voluminous writings. In each of the numerous departments in which he became known through the press, many of his contemporaries have been greatly his superiors in originality of thought, soundness of judgment, and eloquence of style; yet there has always been about his name a prestige of preëminent ability, and the American public at least have taken on trust a great deal more with regard to him than was warranted by any evidence in their possession before his death. His whole intellectual and moral being was so profoundly and beneficently felt in the community of which he was the central object of reverence, as to diffuse through entire Anglo-Saxondom a vague feeling that he was second to none of the controlling spirits of his times. The solution of the problem (and it is more than solved) lies in the volumes before us. Since reading them, we have ceased to regard even the North British Review as extravagant in its reiterated eulogium of him, or to wonder that language, which it seems almost sacrilegious to apply to a fallible mortal, should have been abundantly employed concerning him. His biography has been so generally read, that we shall not attempt a detailed narrative of his life; but shall merely pass in review some of its leading epochs, in connection with a rapid sketch of his character and services.

During the early portion of his professional career, it

---

\* *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of THOMAS CHALMERS, D. D., LL. D.* By his Son-in-law, the REV. WILLIAM HANNA, LL. D. 4 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1850-52. 12mo. pp. 514, 547, 531, 593.



seemed doubtful whether theology or mathematical science would command the full vigor of his intellect. His genius then was Titanic, with the harshness and waywardness of the earth-spirit, and hardly touched with the altar-fire of its future consecration. In common with very many of the Moderate party in the Established Church of Scotland, he entered the ministry less from the love of the Gospel or of souls, than for the sake of a position of ease and leisure for the pursuit of general literature and science. One of his earliest publications, boldly and bitterly recanted in after life, was a plea for the right of the parochial clergy to fill professorships in the universities, on the ground that the duties of their calling demanded but a slender modicum of their time and their abilities. He was no hypocrite. He was a sincere believer in the Christian revelation, and in the theological standards of his church. He was a young man of rigidly pure morality, generous sentiments, and noble aims. He had a natural reverence for the Creator, refined and exalted by his scientific and æsthetic culture, and capable of imparting at times a fervent glow to his spirit and a contagious enthusiasm to his utterance. He could therefore command a certain range of subjects in ethics and in natural theology, on which he could honestly and earnestly write and deliver sermons. He had had little or no association with cultivated persons of a more profound religious experience, and his theological education had been so slight and superficial, as to give him less conversance with the Scriptures than is often acquired in a New England Bible-class. He was prepared to be as a pastor and preacher all that Blair, Robertson, and a host of the intellectual luminaries of the Scottish Church had been. But it is very evident that he had not felt his spiritual poverty, his need of redemption and of the influence of the divine spirit. He had not consecrated his heart and life to the service of God. He had not formed devotional habits, nor had his reverence for Christ as a teacher deepened into trust and affection for him as a Saviour. It was, no doubt, a just ground of reproach to the Established Church, that so low a standard of piety had been suffered to gain the ascendancy, — that it had in fact secularized the pulpit, and left the ministry open to any worldling of respectable character, who was

willing to contract for the perfunctory discharge of its offices. But under such a posture of affairs, we are not authorized to impugn the ingenuousness or integrity of a young man, who had every qualification for his chosen profession which was deemed requisite by a majority of his fellow-countrymen, any more than we blame a Mahometan Mufti, for entering upon his duties destitute of Christian piety.

In the condition of character which we have described, he completed seven years of his ministry at Kilmany, and, as he afterwards confessed, with no appreciable results upon the character of the people under his charge. His splendid essays on the Divine attributes and the glories of the visible universe had passed over the heads of his rustic hearers without touching their hearts; and the lofty morality which he had inculcated was equally inefficient, from his failure to direct his flock to the only Fountain of spiritual strength. He had never recognized in himself, or discovered in the souls under his charge, the disease of the will, the moral inability, to which the Gospel, considered as a remedial system, is specially adapted. He had preached, not as to sinners in need of repentance and in peril of perdition, but as to saints at different stages on the road to heaven.

We find no evidence that any decisive change took place in his religious opinions, or rather in his views of dogmatic theology. In the sermons quoted as written in the unevangelical portion of his ministry, he expresses indeed a degree of resiliency from ultra-Calvinism, but not in a form which would identify him with any more liberal sect, or remove him farther from the centre of orthodoxy than the left wing of the Calvinistic host. But in his subsequent life, it would have been wrong to number him among the extreme members of his party. We can find in his writings no technical statements stringent enough to satisfy the doctrinal martinets in their ranks. We doubt whether he ever gave himself much trouble or thought concerning the polemics of religion, while he reposed on the simple assurance (never by him denied), that Christ had opened the way for the pardon of human guilt, and that trust in his mediation and atonement was to be regarded as the prime motive power on man's part in the Christian life.

But at the crisis of which we are speaking, a moral revolution took place in him, as entire (though less sudden) as that which occurred in Saul of Tarsus. He had vehemently distrusted fervor and enthusiasm on matters of religion, and had never been so zealous as in urging moderation and lukewarmness. His sympathies were with the least earnest and devoted among the clergy. He had written for the Edinburgh Encyclopædia his masterly, but defective, treatise on the Christian Evidences, in which he repudiates the internal evidence of Christianity as utterly unreliable, — a position from which indeed he never logically receded, but in which he never could have found himself, had his spiritual nature been accessible (as it shortly afterwards became) to the intrinsic characteristics of credibility in our religion and its records. But when he was about thirty years of age, a series of domestic afflictions, and a severe illness that brought him to the brink of the grave, induced a profounder view of his own sinfulness and penal liability as a subject of God's moral government, and of his personal need of pardon and redemption. The Gospel was no longer a message to the race, but a revelation to him individually. He was bowed in the lowest depth of self-humiliation and contrition. He cast himself unreservedly upon the Divine mercy through Christ, and consecrated himself with entireness and fervor to the Divine service. He returned to his professional duty an altered, a renewed man, full of his own glowing experience of a new-found redemption, and earnestly solicitous to diffuse that experience among the people of his charge. He now addressed men as sinners, and urged their immediate submission and reconciliation. He preached repentance and regeneration. And now, so far from deeming his work one which left him abundant leisure for scientific and literary labors, he found his days and weeks too short for his dispensation of the word from house to house, for his ministries among the poor, the grief-stricken, and dying, and for such study of the Scriptures as might make him thorough and profound in his public exhibitions of the truth.

His church was thronged, and crowds assembled wherever he preached. His own sincere conviction and fervent feeling held the listeners in absorbed attention,



and often fastened with a lifelong grasp upon their consciences, so that there was hardly a family in his flock that numbered not among its members some whom he had won to the Divine service. Of course he was not suffered to remain long at Kilmany. In 1815, five years after this signal change, he was instituted as minister of the Tron Church in Glasgow. Here he became at once the central object of regard for the whole community. His church doors were absolutely stormed whenever he was to preach. His Astronomical Discourses were delivered at a Thursday lecture, and by tacit consent business was suspended, the seats of traffic deserted, and the living tide of respectability and fashion turned churchward, while indulgent masters released even clerks and apprentices for the hour of sermon.

But Dr. Chalmers effected much more by the weight of his character and the cogency of his influence than by preaching. His eleemosynary administration in Glasgow makes an era in the history of pauperism, and in coming ages his name will be as closely connected with pioneer efforts for the relief and elevation of the dependent poor, as Howard's is with prison reform throughout the civilized world. The only fault in the system which he established, its only perishable element, consisted in its vastness as regarded the capacity of any single supervision. It exceeded the power of any man but its author. It was like the cestus of Entellus, which no inferior arm could wield. But though it was superseded in the district in which it had its birth, at the present moment it is giving substance and definiteness to all the plans of amelioration in this department, which are under discussion or in the incipient stages of experiment, on both sides of the Atlantic. Finding it difficult to overcome the *vis inertiae* of an ancient parochial organization, he procured the erection of the new parish of St. John's in the very poorest quarter of the city. The parish comprised a population of ten thousand, the great majority of them destitute of educational and religious privileges, and a very large proportion of them dependent in part or wholly upon public charity. He insisted on the entire isolation of this district from the pauper administration of the city, and depended solely on voluntary contributions for his relief fund. At the same time

he instituted a system of the most rigid and minute supervision, economical and moral. He established Sunday and day schools, and religious meetings in destitute neighborhoods. He furnished employment where there was the ability to work, and pecuniary aid only where nothing else could be availing. His whole church was organized into a band of city missionaries, under various titles and with various charges, each member of every board having his specific sphere of duty, and the several boards holding frequent meetings for consultation among themselves and with him, and for religious services adapted to furnish and strengthen them for their work. Thus, by the minute subdivision of the territory and of the labor to be performed, an inordinate drain was made upon the time of none; while the Christian charity, which otherwise would have expatiated at random over the whole field, and wrought vaguely and aimlessly, was all made directly operative, and was rigidly economized, so that every gift and effort and hour thus consecrated contributed its full quota toward the grand result. The result we must state in brief. A pauper expenditure, which had been estimated for the territory comprised within that parish at £ 1,400, was reduced to £ 280. At the same time, the standard of general comfort was so much enhanced, that the tide of emigration began to set in from other quarters of the city, and the system found its warmest advocates among the class of people needing its beneficent agency. Profaneness, intemperance, and licentiousness received a decided check. Children grew up with a substantial education and industrious habits. Neatness and domestic thrift, in numerous instances, superseded the lazy squalidness of those who had felt that they were the outcast and abandoned members of the body politic. The experiment deserves to be held up for the instruction of the civilized world. To be sure, there is not everywhere a Chalmers to take the helm; but is there a church that has not disposable strength enough to occupy a definite field of like missionary labor? Nay, would not the active charity which is at work in almost every church, could it be organized and wisely directed, bear similar fruits?

Dr. Chalmers, after a ministry of eight years at Glasgow, accepted the Professorship of Moral Philosophy at

the University of St. Andrews. Here he at once obtained an unbounded influence over the students, — an influence which he employed, not only in the cause of good scholarship, but in awakening a new religious life, and in arousing a missionary spirit for aggression upon surrounding ignorance and vice, and for furthering more distant enterprises of a kindred nature. We cannot ascertain that he made any profound research into pre-existing systems of ethical science, or numbered himself among the adherents of any recognized school. But he virtually adopted the New Testament as his standard authority, and made it his aim to legitimate the morality of the Gospel by appeals to the intuitive conviction of his pupils, and to commend it to their consciences as the arbiter of conduct and the guide of life. In this department, and in the kindred science of political economy which he annexed to it, he was still the Christian minister, with the cause and honor of his Divine Master ever foremost in his regard. This procedure in the hands of a man of ordinary genius would have resulted simply in very poor preaching. But under his treatment moral and political science received a genuine baptism, while Christianity was fortified by evidences of its worth and power drawn from the nature of individual and the whole history of social humanity. His wide range of experience and of general knowledge was all forced into the service, while his fervid and cogent eloquence constrained assent and awakened enthusiastic sympathy. But he stood alone. His colleagues did not rise above respectable mediocrity, and were little disposed to second him, either in his thoroughness and energy as a teacher, or in his evangelical zeal as a Christian reformer. His relations with them, though on his part sustained with uniform consideration and kindness, were by no means happy, and it was with little regret that, after four years at St. Andrews, he suffered himself to be transferred to the Professorship of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

He now found himself in a situation in every sense adapted to his tastes and capacities. He was not, indeed, a systematic theologian, in the ordinary sense of the word. He abhorred the frigid technicalities of his church and party, and made infrequent and awkward



use of them. But he was most thoroughly versed in the Bible, both critically and experimentally. He studied it for himself, with the aid of lexicons and archæologies, but with little assistance from commentaries. Though his conclusions were undoubtedly biassed, without his consciousness, by the set of opinions which he brought to the investigation of the sacred records, he yet drew them in his own way, and expressed them in his own words, thus breathing into scholastic Calvinism a fresh vitality, to which it had been for centuries a stranger. And if his theology was Calvinistic in its members, it was not so in their collocation or in their relative importance. The fundamental doctrines with him were not those which related to the Divine nature or decrees, or to human nature in the abstract, but those which appertained to Christian experience, the unreserved self-surrender of the soul for pardon to redeeming love and for guidance to the influences of the spirit of God. The two cardinal points of his belief were man's moral inability in his own unaided strength, and his unbounded ability through God working in and with him. His unhackneyed treatment of subjects that had previously bristled with unmeaning technicalities, his fusion into glowing realities of the petrified articles of the Confession of Faith, his lectures, drawn not from bodies of divinity (so called because destitute of soul), but from the spirit that was within him, warmed and elevated by recent communion with God at the mercy-seat and by direct access to the sole fountain of revealed truth, commanded crowded and earnest audiences, not alone from the members of the University, but from citizens of various professions and callings. A new epoch was created in the religious life of the metropolis, and his lecture-room was less the seat of scholastic learning for his students, than a radiating point of evangelical influence for the whole community.

It was at this period that the controversy which issued in the disruption of the Scottish Church reached its crisis. The Church depended for its support on endowments and parochial rates, secured and collected under the sanction and patronage of the government. At the same time, the benefices were bestowed by different modes of presentation. In a majority of parishes, the

right of election was vested in the communicants. Some were nominally at the disposal of the crown; but in these the wishes of the people were generally consulted in the choice of the presentee. Others were under the control of individual patrons, and might legally be conferred on clergymen offensive to the whole body of parishioners. But in the institution to all these livings, the law of the Church prescribed the same ecclesiastical forms. A call by the communicants was the nominal basis for the proceedings of the ordaining Presbytery. The Moderate party adhered to the existing order of things, as, if not intrinsically the best system, yet as liable only to rare cases of grievance and hardship, which were more than counterbalanced by the security and order inseparable from a state establishment. The Evangelical party, on the other hand, demanded the right of the congregation, or rather of the communicants, in benefices under the control of private patronage, to veto an unpalatable appointment, and that of the ordaining Presbytery to give effect to such a veto. There was a middle ground, on which the Moderate party would have met the Evangelicals, and on which there was every reason to suppose that Parliament would have given legal sanction to the compromise. That ground was the concession to the ecclesiastical tribunal of the veto power, on the score of immorality or unsoundness of doctrine, but not of compliance with the mere wishes of a recusant congregation. In 1834, the Evangelical party prevailed in the General Assembly, and passed, by a majority of forty-six, a veto act embodying in full their principles, — an act which, however, needed the sanction of the Imperial Parliament in order to become a law of the realm, or to have any binding force, except upon ecclesiastical office-bearers.

The issue was fairly joined a few months after the passage of this act. The Earl of Kinnoul, lay patron of the parish of Auchterarder, presented to that living a Mr. Young, an unordained licentiate. After hearing the candidate preach for two Sabbaths, only two of the inhabitants of a parish containing three thousand souls came forward to sign the call, while there was a solemn protest entered by more than nineteen twentieths of the communicants against the settlement. The Presbytery

adjourned the case, which was carried by appeal to the Synod, and thence to the General Assembly, whence it was remitted to the Presbytery, with instructions to adhere to the provisions of the veto act. The presentee and his patron then raised an action against the Presbytery in the Court of Sessions, the supreme civil court of Scotland. The decision was in favor of the claimants by a majority of eight judges against five, Lord Jeffrey and his biographer, Lord Cockburn, both having been of the minority. An appeal was carried to the House of Lords, which, in 1839, finally confirmed the decision of the Court of Sessions. By a subsequent decision of the court, confirmed in 1842 by the House of Lords, an action of damages against the recusant Presbytery was sustained, and it was held that they were bound by an indefeasible civil obligation, not only to surrender the temporalities of the benefice (which the Evangelical party were ready to do whenever the candidate nominated by the patron was vetoed), but to perform such religious rites as should qualify the presentee for the full discharge of his official duties. In the interval between these two decisions there had been on the side of the majority of the Assembly a series of negotiations with her Majesty's ministry, with a view to an amicable settlement, and on the side of the courts repeated aggressions upon the rights and liberties of the Church as guaranteed by immemorial usage. After the second decision, there was held a convocation of the Evangelical clergy, to deliberate upon the ulterior measures to be taken in case there should be no retrocession on the part of the government. About four hundred and fifty were present. Dr. Chalmers presided, and preached at the opening of the meeting. His text was, "Unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness," and his subject, the essential connection between integrity of purpose and clearness of discernment, — the necessity of being right morally and spiritually, in order that we may be right intellectually. By this convocation the plan of future action was matured, and on the 18th of May, 1843, the party which had constituted it withdrew in a body from the General Assembly, and formed immediately the first General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, with Dr. Chalmers in the chair as moderator.



In every stage of this movement Dr. Chalmers held the foremost place in counsel and service. Every remonstrance, resolution, and negotiation bore the impress of his energy; and under Providence he was undoubtedly the main, probably the indispensable, instrument in effecting the ecclesiastical and spiritual emancipation of the best part of his nation. We believe the result to have been of inestimable worth to the cause of practical piety and diffusive philanthropy. Yet we cannot but regard his position, prior to the disruption, as anomalous and untenable. He was not in favor of a free church till it was forced upon him as the only alternative remaining. On the other hand, he had been through life so strenuous a champion of national religious establishments, that his services had, not many years previously, been enlisted by leading members of the English Church during a season of imagined danger, and he had delivered in London a course of lectures in advocacy of the cause of establishments, with large numbers of the prelacy and the beneficed clergy among his admiring audience. But what he desired was a church supported by the state, yet governed by its own legislative and judicial tribunals. He refused to recognize the principle, that the obligation to sustain and the right to control are inseparable. The Moderate party were, no doubt, sound in their view of the actual constitution of their Church. Lay patronage, where it existed, was in the nature of personal and hereditary property. It grew out of endowments conferred by the ancestry of the several patrons. It was a vested right, the exercise of which, like that of any other vested right, might incidentally become oppressive or burdensome. The true question, therefore, was, not whether that right should be arbitrarily confiscated by the state, but whether its liability to abuse was an evil of sufficient magnitude to authorize secession. In this last form Dr. Chalmers would probably have answered it in the negative, during all the earlier stages of the controversy. Yet we believe that it was under the special leading of the great Head of the Church that the final result was effected. The evils complained of were of so rare occurrence, and of so transient duration, as to constitute an entirely insufficient ground for separation from a church that was

actually performing its true and full work as an evangelical institution. But emancipation from governmental control has proved a blessing of incalculable magnitude to the churches now organized on the voluntary system. The Free Church in a very brief period of time became stronger than the Establishment had previously been. Its missionary operations at home and abroad are now vastly more extensive and munificent than were those of all Scotland before. Its ordinances are sustained with the most liberal zeal. Its clergy, as a body, are zealous and devoted, and a very large proportion of them have a national celebrity and influence. Meanwhile, their self-sacrifice and their fervent piety have kindled new life in the Establishment and in the various dissenting bodies that previously existed; and it is impossible that, had the event been otherwise, the collective standard of religious sentiment and practice could have approximated to its present height, or that any system of church extension could have brought so large a proportion of the people within the pale of Christian influence.

By the act of secession more than six hundred congregations were ejected from their places of worship, and their pastors were compelled to forsake their manse, and to rely on Providence for their own sustenance and that of their families. At the outset great sufferings and hardships were incurred. In many localities divine worship was celebrated in barns or in the open air; and not infrequently congregations were hunted from place to place by proprietors stubbornly attached to the Establishment. Ministers were, in not a few instances, driven from ample and comfortable homes to take shelter in leaky and unfurnished hovels; and in several cases death ensued in consequence of want and exposure, and was met in the true martyr spirit. The most vigorous measures were requisite for the collection of funds and the organization of modes of assessment for the building of churches and the support of their incumbents. Dr. Chalmers was the financial head of the Free Church, and elaborated its fiscal system with a skill and prudence which indicated the very highest order of administrative talent. Large contributions came from dissenting churches in other parts of the kingdom, and from the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of the

United States; but these, under his auspices, were received as tokens of Christian sympathy, not as resources to be relied upon, even in postponement of the most energetic measures of self-help. He persuaded his associates to seize the moment of enthusiasm for the development of a permanent system of finance, and for the immediate establishment of the educational and philanthropic organizations which would be needed to train the children of the Church, to replenish its ministry, and to extend its usefulness in the various walks of Christian benevolence. He of course lost his office in the University; but became at once, and continued till his death, Professor of Divinity in the new college established by the Free Church.

So soon as the work of organization was completed, Dr. Chalmers retired from active and official duty in the management of church affairs, and devoted all the leisure at his command to a home mission in the West-Port, a neglected, depraved, and poverty-stricken district of Edinburgh. Out of a population of two thousand, three fourths were in a condition of virtual heathenism. At the close of his labors there was a flourishing church established in the West-Port, self-sustaining, and capable of contributing seventy pounds per annum for purposes of Christian charity. There was not known to be a child who was not at school. The whole face of society was renovated, and the entire population bore the aspect of a highly industrious, moral, and religious community.

The last few months of his life were among the most serene and happy of his whole pilgrimage. He revisited his birthplace, and renewed his acquaintance with the few who remembered him in his boyhood. He made a journey to London, and enjoyed a succession of delightful interviews and hospitalities with friends old and new. Wherever he went, his presence was welcomed as a patriarch's benediction, and his conversations and letters breathed the spirit of one close on the borders of the heavenly inheritance. On Friday night, May 28, 1847, he arrived at Edinburgh on his return from this journey. On the following Monday morning his housekeeper knocked at his door to deliver a message. Receiving no answer, she entered his chamber, and drew aside the



curtains of his bed. He sat there half erect, with a tranquil expression of countenance. He had been dead for hours, and his attitude indicated that his spirit must have been translated without pain or conflict. His last evening had been peculiarly happy. His last act, before wishing "a general good-night," had been to unite in family worship. To his brother minister, who led that service, he had said, "Well, you will give worship to-night; *I expect to give worship to-morrow morning.*" In how ecstatic a sense was that expectation realized! How nobly trained was that strong, brave, meek, loving, devout spirit, for the worship of the upper sanctuary and for the fellowship of the saints in light!

In estimating the genius and services of Dr. Chalmers, the first thing that arrests our regard is his indomitable force of character. The man himself was more than any thing that he said or did. There was a reserved power, the summit-level of which was never lowered by the most imperious drains at its fountain. While his lamp was always trimmed and burning, his vessel was always overflowing with oil. He was never imperious or arbitrary, except under sudden surprise, or under difficulties which, incapable of being obviated, could only be overborne and crushed. But his quiet energy, instead of rising equal to any emergency, seemed always more than adequate to any possible emergency. He laid his plans deliberately, counted the cost, measured counter-acting forces, marshalled his resources, and determined that a thing must be done, only when he had satisfied himself that it could be done. But the determination once made, he marched right onward to its execution. The signature of his indomitable energy seems to have been inscribed on his countenance, gait, and manner, so that his mere presence inspired confidence, his simplest demand enlisted coöperation, and his advocacy of the least popular cause gave it weight and worth. His power was not put forth, but rather went forth from him. Incessant and strenuous action was the normal condition of his mental and moral nature.

In all that we have said of him, it has been implied that he was evidently a man of his own times, a denizen of the present, rather than of the past or future. It was only incidentally, and without express purpose, that he

labored for posterity. Nor did he ever write any thing, so far as we remember, with the usual aim and consciousness of authorship. His voluminous works, comprising several treatises of permanent value and a large amount of Biblical comment, consist of articles for reviews and cyclopædias, parish and occasional sermons, lectures to his classes, essays on the economical questions of the day, Scriptural readings in his church, his family, and at his private devotions. The social or public interest nearest at hand, the most urgent need of the community or the nation, the latest grievance, the heresy just promulgated, the question pending before the General Assembly or the Parliament, was for the time being the foremost concern, and occupied his lips, his pen, and his secret thoughts. Even in his seasons of secluded meditation and prayer, the engrossing topic was never dropped from sight, and many were the petitions entered upon his diary, having sole and circumstantial reference to the plan, question, or negotiation then uppermost in his mind. This feature of his mental activity furnishes the standard by which his works are to be measured. They are to be regarded, not critically so much as historically, — to be judged, not by their intrinsic worth, but by their adaptation to temporary purposes. With this criterion in view, we shall not be surprised that treatises which seem defective, disjointed, and repetitiously wordy, excited, when they first appeared, universal attention and admiration, and contributed largely to the author's fame. They met the then existing need; in their seeming defects and redundancies, they were moulded by the form and pressure of the times, and had a virtual completeness and unity because they fitted into the niche which they were designed to fill.

Dr. Chalmers possessed, in a degree rarely equalled and never surpassed, that power of mental concentration which, if it be not the chief constituent, is the unvarying concomitant of genius. He never wrought with a single faculty awake and the rest dormant. Whatever he did, it was with mind, soul, and strength, with his judgment on the tribunal, with fancy on the wing, with his sympathies in the fulness of their fervor, with his devotional nature warm and active. Had he confined himself to a single department, he would have been unani-

mously pronounced a great genius. If he fails of that award, it must be by the universality of his mental enterprise. We are astonished at the range which he occupied, and are at a loss to name the department in which he excelled. Theology and pauperism, ethics and finance, mathematics and foreign missions, German metaphysics and the application of chemistry to the arts, by turns received his profoundest thoughts, and were brought under the full tension of his intellect; nor could the church or the public proffer any demand upon his services which he was not prepared and furnished to meet.

He was to a very imperfect degree a book-scholar. Except treatises of practical devotion, he read only what he was constrained to read in order to escape the imputation of ignorance. His own thoughts were his library. He viewed every subject in its intrinsic merits, and cared little for what others had said or written about it. His views were therefore original, with the unmistakable tokens of the free, independent action of his own mind. This gave a freshness and raciness to his writings, which secured for them on their first appearance a wide-spread popularity. But at the same time it detracted from their permanent interest and usefulness. Taking so little cognizance of what others had done before him, he gave clear and comprehensive first views of his subject from his own peculiar point of observation, instead of taking it up where preceding writers had left it, and submitting it to profounder research and more thorough scrutiny. We should, therefore, call him a superficial thinker and writer, though in an immeasurably higher sense than is commonly attached to those words; for his superficial glance always detected what had been before unseen, or brought familiar points into new combinations or contrasts.

We ought not to omit, in our view of his intellectual character, the system of religious self-discipline to which he was largely indebted for its vigor and fervor. Though the busiest of men, he never permitted a day to pass without its prolonged season of meditation and prayer, and in addition to this he uniformly consecrated certain days of the month and year to fasting and peculiar exercises of devotion. The glow of his communion with



God rested on all his converse with men, and visibly pervades all his works, so that on secular subjects he writes as one whose place was very near the heart of his Saviour. His external life seemed prayer in action,—the prolongation of the unfinished petition or thanksgiving of his closet; nor has he left a printed page which, with his wonderful power of devotional assimilation, he could not have easily transmuted into an address to the Deity.

Of Dr. Chalmers's style we cannot speak with admiration. He could have had only the most imperfect rhetorical training, with no ear for rhythm or euphony, and with a very sluggish intuition as to the nature and power of words. We doubt whether he was ever at pains to classify and systematize his thoughts before he began to write. He let his thoughts work themselves clear by their fermentation on paper, and we have the foam and sputter with the liquid flow for which they prepared the way. Many of his sentences and paragraphs are master-works of circumlocution and indirection. His solecisms and barbarisms in grammar and phraseology are innumerable, and clumsily coined words, to which the most hospitable lexicographer would give no quarter, perpetually occupy the place of our vernacular English. His method of eliminating a thought is that of successive approximations. He often reminds us of a painter of decided genius with no skill in the details of his art, who tries bold strokes of his brush, and lays on color after color, till at length from a chaotic *imbroglio* a limb of a tree peeps out, a bend of a river gleams upon the sight, a sunset ray shoots across the canvas, and the whole landscape gradually reveals itself. The worst of the case is, that he has raised up a horde of imitators, many of them destitute of his genius and fervor, but pranked out in his most offensive mannerisms. Not a number of the North British Review, of which he was the first editor, reaches us, without constraining the exclamation, "He, being dead, yet speaketh." The Review is given over to Chalmerisms, and among its best articles since his death there have been not a few of which, from the strongest marks of internal evidence, we should have pronounced him the author.

As to the traits of his personal character, we cannot find words adequate to convey our lofty appreciation of

Dr. Chalmers. His nature was in every aspect of massive elements and proportions. His perceptions were acute, his sensibilities keen, his passions by nature vehement. There was a roughness and jaggedness about his outline, which stood in special need of the intenerating and harmonizing influences of religion, but which, thus modified, only enhance our impression of his substantial greatness. His social sympathies were warm and ardent, and his intercourse with people of every description was marked by an honest heartiness, which comprehended the entire soul of good-breeding, while it was perpetually running athwart its conventional canons. He obeyed with more than literal exactness, because with spontaneous alacrity, the precept, Honor all men. Among his intimates were often persons of slender culture and of humble pretensions, whose virtues were in lieu of graces, and whose lore of the Bible and the heart was all their learning. Children had more than his affection, — his considerate respect and careful courtesy. He was a lover of hospitality, and from the enthusiastically grateful memorials of numerous occasions when he was the guest of others, we may deem his always open house to have been a perpetual paradise, if in this kind he indeed found it more blessed to give than to receive. He was simple in all his tastes and habits, prompt and cordial in his sympathies, and, while profoundly sensitive to the graver aspects of life, fond of wit and humor, gayety and mirth, in their season. In his intercourse with the world, we discern not the slightest trace of asceticism. Yet in the rigidity of his self-discipline he sometimes practised an almost morbid severity, especially in the matter of diet, in which he would often condemn himself for excess when he had attracted the notice of others by his abstemiousness. Lowly in his self-estimate, and deeply humbled before God under a sense of deficiency and unworthiness, he yet had the just self-appreciation and true manliness which made him always ready to take his fitting place, though it were the foremost, if it only was a place of service and of sacrifice. In early life he was ambitious of literary and still more of scientific eminence; but after the turning crisis of his religious history his ambition seemed wholly merged in his desire to be useful, and we can discern no reference to

reputation, applause, or fame, but, on the other hand, a readiness to resign all these for the cause of Christ and of man.

As a preacher, measured by his popularity and influence, he held during the greater part of his lifetime the first place among the divines of the British empire, perhaps of the world. But there is nothing in his printed sermons that can account for his immense audiences and the intense enthusiasm with which he inspired them. His sermons have all the faults of style that appertain to his more elaborate treatises, and they are faults which were more likely to obscure the meaning and to blunt the impetus of uttered discourse, than to injure the effect of the printed page. A part of his success in this department is to be ascribed to the school of preachers which he succeeded. The elegant and languid *platitudes* of Blair may stand as the representative of the reigning fashion of the Scotch pulpit for the last half of the eighteenth century. A preacher thoroughly alive, deeply in earnest, dealing with Christian doctrines as verities of infinite moment, speaking from profound experience, addressing men as imperilled sinners, was a novelty in cultivated circles and among metropolitan auditories. Then, too, there was a vastness and grandeur about his entire personality, that supplied point and gave emphasis to his utterances. He had no tricks of oratory, used but little gesture, and that little awkward, and spoke in a broad Scotch accent; but at the same time there was always the power resulting from deep conviction and fervent purpose, — from the felt assurance that he had verified in his own consciousness the Gospel which he dispensed.

His influence in his day and generation, and upon generations yet unborn, cannot be overrated. In the application of Christian principles to ethics, politics, and social economy, he held the place of a pioneer; and, though his speculations were often crude and on no subject thoroughly systematized, he gave the initial impulse to the religious philosophy of the present age. His labors for the poor in Glasgow, St. Andrews, and Edinburgh were by far the most successful experiments in the aggression of Christian philanthropy upon the penury, vice, and wretchedness in great cities, and are



just beginning to give the tone to similar enterprises in Europe and America, while they make the nearest approach in modern history to a practical demonstration of the sufficiency of the Gospel remedy for the evils to which unevangelized humanity falls the prey. How successful he was in the work of university reform we have not the means of knowing. But this at least is evident from the Memoir. He found the universities in a condition in which the pupils did little and the professors less, — ancient rookeries, venerable by immemorial prescription, but imperfectly adapted to the tastes and needs of the present century; and he assumed his successive chairs of instruction as a man of the present and the future, and took every fair and lawful means to enlist the interest of colleagues, students, and the community at large in elevating and liberalizing the standard of academic education.

But it is as the leader of the evangelical movement in Scotland that his influence has been and will yet be most potently felt. And here we use the word *evangelical*, not alone in its party significance, but as designating what we regard to have been the cause of practical piety. Our doctrinal affinities, indeed, might ally us more nearly to the Moderate party. But our moral antipathies are still stronger against them. We can regard neither with sympathy nor with respect a party which maintains a formal adherence to doctrines alien from its belief. If there be such a thing as "holding the truth in unrighteousness," the censure of so doing attaches itself preëminently to those who, for the sake of ease and emolument, assent to errors which at heart they repudiate. It is a position which can hardly fail to deaden the conscience and corrupt the character. Accordingly, there had been among the Moderatists of the Scotch Church every shade of practical latitudinarianism, and among its leading divines there were, in the last century, not a few who were on terms of more cordial intimacy with the infidel *literati* of Edinburgh than was consistent with any vitality of Christian faith or experience. Chalmers took the lead in the party that vindicated its honesty, by maintaining the doctrines of the Church in their literal import. Its Confession of Faith is thoroughly Calvinistic, and only Calvinists could

fairly seek shelter within its pale: He had assumed before the disruption the leading place in its enterprises of church extension and missionary operation abroad, and through his agency systematic and vigorous organizations for these ends were instituted and carried into successful operation. Of the Free Church he was in every sense the head. We doubt whether the non-intrusion controversy would, without him, have reached its crisis, or the bold measure of secession have been devised and consummated. Still less probable is it that, under any other leadership, the new ecclesiastical organization could have grown at once into self-sustaining strength, and have taken its place as the most influential religious body in Scotland. He traversed the country to institute parochial societies for the building of churches and the support of the clergy. He trained the rising generation of ministers. He established and conducted the literary organ of the new church, which at once assumed an equal, if not a superior, position in criticism, in political economy, and in natural science, with that of the Edinburgh and the London Quarterly. His self-sacrifice, his fervent piety, his earnest philanthropy, gave the tone to the whole body of seceders, established for them a lofty standard of personal devotion and Christian propagandism, and have largely contributed to their strength in all that constitutes the vitality and efficiency of a religious body. If through the Free Church of Scotland the voluntary system in religion is to demonstrate its incontestable superiority, and ultimately to identify itself with Protestantism on British soil, (and we cannot doubt that it will,) Chalmers will transmit his name to all coming time, as the master-spirit in a reformation, hardly second in its bearing on the highest interests of Great Britain to that of which Knox was the pioneer in Scotland, and which was arrested half way in England under the semi-Romanist auspices of Elizabeth and her successors.

The Memoir under review owes its interest wholly to its subject, and not in the least to the compiler's skill. It is a huge, undigested mass of minute narrative, letters, extracts from journals, scraps of speeches, fragments of sermons, and contemporary civil and ecclesiastical history. It would bear condensation to one half of its

present volume without detriment. It must be abridged, as we think, before it can reach a second edition. Yet we have read it without weariness; for while Chalmers occupies so large a place in the general heart of Christendom, we can enjoy the most prolix details and the most superfluous repetitions. We apprehend that it has done much more for Chalmers's fame than all that ever issued from his own pen. If it fails to give us an artistical sketch of his genius and character, it supplies us with all possible materials for doing this for ourselves. It inspires us with the filial reverence and love, which would not suffer Dr. Hanna to omit the most trivial incident of his life, or the most secret record of his internal conflicts, trials, consolations, and joys. We are thankful for having been brought into such intimate communion with one of the greatest and best of men. It has refreshed and strengthened us. It has made us conversant with a spirit nobly endowed, and yet more nobly consecrated, — with an example that reflects with unrivalled clearness and beauty the traits of the all-perfect Model, — with a life in all its aspects commanding our affectionate reverence and our gratitude to Him from whom "cometh down every good and every perfect gift."

A. P. P.

---

ART. VI. — ON THE PHRASE, "THE WORD OF GOD."

HAS God ever spoken? If we understand this phrase in its gross and literal meaning, we must answer, No, He has never spoken. But figuratively, and according to the most natural of all figures, God is speaking continually and in various ways. "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time," said our Lord to the Jews, "nor seen his shape"; and yet through that Mediator he both uttered and revealed himself. And other mediators there are, in Providence and the world's government, in human life and the human mind, through whom his speech is heard. The Hebrews were much accustomed to representations of this kind. If they would describe the



Deity as the Maker of the Universe, we are made to hear his voice. He says, Let light be, and it is. He speaks, and it is done. He commands, and all things are created. When the showers fall, and the clouds are driven along like ships with a rich lading, and the ground quickens into innumerable forms of vegetable life, it is "his word that runneth swiftly." "He saith to the snow, Be thou on the earth; likewise to the small rain and to the great rain of his strength." And they call the thunder his voice, because of its majesty, its height over their heads, its flaming arrows, and its mysterious nature which they did not understand. We propose to show the several applications of the phrase, "the word of God," which are to be found in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and then to offer a few remarks on the manner in which it is used among ourselves, or in which it will still become us to use it.

We begin, then, by referring to the Scriptures. And here we discover four leading significations, to which may be reduced all the instances that are to be found of the term in question. 1. It is employed often to denote any individual expression of the Divine will; whether in the way of command or assurance, whether addressed to man or to any other subject. Of this take the following examples: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "The word of God came to Nathan," that he should reprove David; "to Jonah," that he should prophesy against Nineveh; "to John in the wilderness," that he should preach repentance and the coming kingdom. "His word was in my heart," says Jeremiah, "like a burning flame"; that is, the impulse which he felt to declare to his countrymen the counsel of the Lord was too strong to be restrained. "As the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven," we read in Isaiah, "and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud; so shall my word be"; that is, every decree and purpose of mine shall be accomplished in blessings. "The word of the Lord is against thee," describes the Divine threatening. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever," means that the Divine promises are unfailing.

2. The second class includes those passages, in which

"the word of God" is used to denote the whole system of religious duty, and that especially which is prescribed in the Mosaic ritual. Many examples of this are found in the Book of Psalms: "I will delight in thy statutes, I will not forget thy word." "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept thy word." "Our fathers have not kept the word of the Lord," is a frequent confession of the Israelites; and when Micah and Isaiah declare that "the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," they mean that the religion of Moses should fill the earth. "He called them gods," said Jesus, "to whom the word of God" — or the Mosaic covenant — "came." He rebuked the Scribes and Pharisees for having made that same word of none effect by their traditions.

3. We come, in the third place, to take notice of a remarkable peculiarity, which is not so easily understood, and is found only in the writings of John. He calls Christ himself the "Word of God," and the "Living Word," on account of his being the great revealer of sacred truth, the commissioned one of the Father, the Mediator between heaven and earth. On first opening his Gospel we meet with a passage which has given occasion for large volumes of controversy. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. And the Word was made flesh," — or a man, — "and dwelt among us. And we beheld his glory, as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." To understand this, it is not necessary to enter into any refinements or learned discussions. A few words will make it clearer, perhaps, than would many. We have already seen that the Hebrews ascribed the creation of the world and all the subsequent operations of nature to the spoken commandment of God, or to his word. This they sometimes also called his wisdom; and indeed they seem to have intended by it the Divine power or intelligence or goodness as manifested in action. They soon went out into bold personifications of this attribute; of which we have a beautiful example in the Book of Proverbs. It is in the address of Wisdom to mankind: "I was set up from everlasting, from the be-

ginning, or ever the earth was. When the Lord prepared the heavens, I was there; when he set a compass upon the face of the deep. When he appointed the foundations of the earth, then I was by him, as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him." But they did not end with mere personification. They afterwards came to imagine that this Word or Wisdom was literally a Being, distinct from the Deity. And this they were the sooner led to do, on account of their custom of using the name, The Word, or Lord, instead of Jehovah, which they had a superstitious fear of pronouncing. There is a passage in the apocryphal book called "The Wisdom of Solomon," which might almost lead us to suppose that this error had already taken place. The author is describing the destruction of the Egyptian first-born, and this is his language: "While all things were in quiet silence, and night was in the midst of her swift course, thine Almighty Word leaped down from heaven out of the royal throne, as a fierce warrior into the midst of a land of destruction. It touched the heaven, but it stood upon the earth." Was it not then the object of John to show, that the Word, or Wisdom, was nothing distinct from God himself; that it united itself to Jesus, and thus constituted him the authorized teacher of mankind? When in the book of Revelation, also, he describes Christ as a military chief, seated on a white horse, and prevailing against all his enemies, he adds, "and his name was called the Word of God."

4. There is but one other signification remaining to be pointed out, and it is that which is the most conspicuous one in the New Testament. The Christian religion is there continually intended by "the word of God." The word is the seed, dropped in different places;—on the stones, and on the deep, rich soil. It is "preached" by the Apostles. It is here "rejected" and here "received." It is said to "grow" and "prevail." Peter says that men are "born again" by it; and John says that "it abideth in those who have overcome" evil. It is "corrupted" and "handled deceitfully" by false teachers. In all these instances and innumerable others, the Gospel is clearly designated.

Thus there are seen to be four Scriptural meanings



of the phrase, "the Word of God." It signifies any individual expression of the Divine will, whether in the way of command or assurance; our religious duties in general, and especially the Mosaic system; Jesus Christ, as a divine teacher; and his religion, as divine truth. In this enumeration we must perceive that the Scriptures, whether the Jewish or our own, are not included. When one speaks now, indeed, of the word of God, he is understood most readily to mean those two collections of sacred books. This has become the general usage, though it is nowhere authorized by the books themselves; and we are so accustomed to it, that some persons may be surprised to hear it has no such sanction. It deserves, however, to be mentioned, now that we have come to offer some reflections, as we proposed to do, on the several ways in which we of the present day apply, or may apply it.

From the early days of the Church till now, it has been common to call the Bible the word of God. If we are asked why we continue to call it so, we have but this answer to give: Because we learn there so much of the Divine character and dispensations; because its histories are so instructive, its precepts so holy, and the spirit of its devotional parts so elevated and fervent; because it is the record of those revelations which have been successively made to men, and perpetuates the memory of the most important events that were ever acted. We have no other reasons to give; but are any others required? Here is the text-book of religious instruction for a large part of the civilized world. It carries us far back to the rude states of society which it helped to improve; and it remains the light of our own better times. It contains the visions of prophets, the breathing piety of holy men, the instructions of more than the earth's wisest, the testimony of God. In the ages that have gone before us it has been a guide and deliverer, the sustainer of the heavy-laden, and the teacher of babes; and what less is it now to our passing generations? Where else will the aged find so strong a support, the young so faithful a direction, the anxious such a refuge, the afflicted such consolations? Where else is the way of safety so plainly marked, and the bitter end of transgression so fearfully told? Where else

are written down for us so many precious assurances, announced with authority and amidst the glories of "immortality brought to light"? What volume beside has so many remembrances and hopes for us, as we hasten into the land of forgetfulness? What other can prepare us so nobly for duties and trials while we live, or pour such a dirge over our dust? Where is to be discovered another book which has so enriched the store of our thoughts and expressions on the highest subjects; or from which we borrow such illustrations of the almighty sovereignty and love? Let it be found, and we will call that "the Word of God." But we shall look for it in vain. It cannot be traced in any writings of the past, or imagined to be disclosed in any future time. What waters of life ever flowed from the fossil characters of Egypt, or the arrow-headed stamps of Babylonian clay? What light is to break out from the Koran, or the old Vedas, or the Zend-Avesta, or the Chou-King? We call the Bible by so high a title, because it is so eminently profitable for doctrine, and reproof, and instruction in hope, and instruction in righteousness; and for no other cause. True, we often hear it spoken of as if that appellation literally belonged to it, — as if the Almighty could be said to have written a book. This idea is entirely without warrant. There is no sense conceivable in which it approaches the truth; unless we lapse into the astonishing theory of a plenary verbal inspiration. We cannot easily be reconciled to those lines of Watts, though we can forgive the grand Isaac almost any thing: —

"Great God, if once compared with thine,  
How mean their writings look!"

But this is poetry. We find the following passage in a celebrated sermon: "We believe that God, when he condescends to speak and write, submits, if we may so say, to the established rules of speaking and writing." There is something extremely unpleasant and unworthy in expressions like these. With whatever freedom from superstitious and gross conceptions they may be spoken, they certainly tend to cherish such conceptions in others.

But passing from this topic, we acknowledge that Christ and his Gospel are the word of God, now, as they were in the beginning, and as they will always be.

The law of Moses is so no longer. Except in its moral commandments, it was a temporary, imperfect, political thing; and its authority is gone. But where is the authority that will ever take precedence of this covenant of promise and reign of heaven? The kingdoms of this world have flourished and fallen; but the kingdom not of this world, standing in knowledge and goodness, shall go on to spread till the consummation of all things. This is the truth that sanctifies. This is the grace that saves. All that has just been said of the Scriptures is applicable here; for Christianity has given them all their completeness. More than it is possible to say of them might be said here, for Christianity is not letter, but spirit. It is something which its records teach and perpetuate, but which looks beyond all records; which exists in the mind as it expands, and in the heart as it grows purer. It is "the word of God" to the doubtful, the timid, the disconsolate, saying, "Fear not, nor let your heart be troubled, O ye of little faith!" It is "the word of God" over all the agitations and passions of life, with its "Peace, be still!" It is "the word of God" against "those who obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness," threatening retribution and anguish; for it declares a time when the secrets of all hearts shall be searched and made manifest and brought into judgment. It is "his word" to the contrite, — forgiveness; "his word" to the perishing, — hope; "his word" to those who every day see prosperous fortunes changing, and fair hopes blighted, and mortal things turning into decay, — "All souls are mine."

There is no desire that springs up more naturally in the mind, than that the inscrutable Being, who framed the universe and controls our whole destiny, should manifest himself to us plainly. This desire is seen in all the inventions of superstition, in the imaginations of the contemplative, in the anxious search into futurity and the breathless listenings at its dark doors, which have been common to all periods of the world. To attain such an object, the whole creation — to use the strong metaphor of the Apostle — has been in labor. "Prophets and kings desired" it; and they who had no inspiration but that of a plain understanding, and no rank but that of moral beings, have not desired or need-



ed it less. That object has been gained, and that anxiety laid to rest, in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We have seen the Father, if we have known *him*; and fear is cast out if there is perfected within us the love of *him*; and we are born again into new feelings and a better country if we are truly the followers of *him*. We do not say with Philip, "Show us the Father." His Word has declared him. The distance from Him to us seems unspeakably diminished, when we discern that Mediator standing between. He is no longer unknown, though he must always be the Incomprehensible. The cloud is still on the mercy-seat; but there has come a voice from the cloud: "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him."

We may well regard as "the word of God" every dictate of an enlightened judgment, every plain prompting of conscience, every call to duty, every opportunity of rendering service, and every intimation of what he would have us perform. And to these we may add all the events that impress us with thoughts of his providence, and all the witnesses to himself in creation, that declare his being, and agency, and perfections. The first is his word within us; and it is not feebly or ambiguously spoken. Not more distinct were the intimations that came to holy men of old, when they were moved with the Holy Ghost. It teaches what to do, what to forbear, and what to expect. It reasons, warns, persuades. It entreats us by his mercy. It entreats us by his fear. It charges us on our souls. We know what it requires, without asking for a sign from heaven, as did a modern philosopher, Lord Herbert; or laying claim to a familiar spirit, as did Socrates, the wisest of the ancients. The other is his word around us. We hear it from the heavens that declare his glory, and from the earth that is full of his praise, and in the whole harmony of things. We may listen to it alike in the wondrous works which he has made, and in the course of events which he directs. It will tell us of a wise and ruling hand extended equally over them both; and more, it will remind us of that upper inheritance, where nature will suffer no death, and the joys of the blessed no reverses.

## ART. VII.—MACAULAY'S SPEECHES.\*

POLITICS and general literature rarely flourish together on the same intellectual soil. So few persons, indeed, obtain eminence in both, that it should seem as though there were something incompatible in the thorough practical study of political science and the successful culture of elegant letters. In retracing the history of the last two or three centuries, not more than half a dozen names will be found alike distinguished for their political weight and their literary reputation; and in our own time we can scarcely add another name of equal brilliance to that splendid list which includes only the names of Guizot, Macaulay, and of our own all-accomplished scholar and statesman, Mr. Everett. It is true that Mr. Bancroft, Washington Irving, Lord Mahon, Mr. D'Israeli, Thiers, Lamartine, and some others, have essayed to unite literary labors with active service in diplomatic stations or in the legislative and administrative departments of government. But in neither case has equal reputation been obtained in both fields of endeavor; and it is impossible for any failure to be more signal than that which marked the political career of the sentimental Frenchman. Not one of them, in fact, unless we may except Thiers, has successfully united the characters of statesman and man of letters; and even that restless politician can only take secondary rank as an historian. Yet it should seem that the mental qualities which the highest order of statesmanship demands are precisely those which should be most largely developed in the great scholar. Both should unite great force of mind, habits of clear and precise thought, and quickness of apprehension, with broad, comprehensive views, and a ready mastery of language. Still, from some cause or another, it is an undeniable fact, that great scholars are as little likely to shine in political life as great statesmen are to win increased reputation by purely literary labors. But whether this is owing to

\* *Speeches by the RT. HON. THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY, M. P.*, Author of "The History of England from the Accession of James the Second," "Lays of Ancient Rome," "Essays from the Edinburgh Review," etc. In two volumes. New York: Redfield. 1853. 12mo. pp. 403, 401.

any intrinsic incompatibility in the two, or whether it is merely to be traced to the operation of that law of our nature which forbids the attainment of great distinction in any department of mental endeavor, except as a reward for the active and undivided exercise of all our faculties, is a question that we do not now intend to discuss. We propose to occupy narrower ground, and confine ourselves to an examination of the speeches and statesmanship of one of the most remarkable exceptions to the truth of the general rule to be found in all history.

In Mr. Macaulay we witness a remarkable union of political and literary eminence. As an essayist and an historian he has no superior now living. In Parliament he at once took high rank as an accomplished statesman; and he has twice risen to the dignity of a cabinet minister. But if his literary and his political life have generally run in parallel lines, the one has sometimes overlapped the other; and the splendor of his reputation as a man of letters has greatly overshadowed his Parliamentary fame. It cannot be doubted that many persons, in their admiration of his powers as an historian, have quite forgotten the large and important part which he took in the discussion of the Reform Bill and in various important debates since that time. Yet many of his speeches were amongst the most powerful arguments urged in those debates. Something of this ignorance of his Parliamentary oratory is perhaps due to the fact, that his speeches have never before been printed in an enduring form, except in the voluminous pages of Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, and that there they are very imperfectly reported. The edition before us follows the reports in Hansard's collection; and we are sorry to say that it reproduces the obvious errors contained in them. So numerous are these errors, that we have understood that Mr. Macaulay, on a former occasion, refused his assent to a republication of the speeches, on the ground of the inaccuracy of the reports. It is greatly to be regretted that a competent editor was not employed to correct the more obvious and important errors, and to add some necessary explanatory notes. In other respects the edition is a very good one, and is entitled to public confidence as a complete collection of Mr. Macaulay's Parliamentary speeches. Besides these



speeches, the volumes also contain his brilliant and striking inaugural address as Lord Rector of Glasgow University, his speech at Edinburgh in November last, a very truculent article in defence of the Canning administration, from the *Edinburgh Review*, and an article, from the same journal, on the state of parties in 1827.\*

The general features and characteristics of Mr. Macaulay's oratory are such as one would expect to find from an acquaintance with his writings. His style has the same grand and majestic sweep, the same affluence of historical illustration, the same keenness of wit and bitterness of sarcasm, and the same terrible power of invective. His command of words is even more remarkable in his speeches than in his essays. Always richly freighted with meaning and instinct with life, his stores of language and illustration seem to be inexhaustible. When he is at all aroused, his sentences are poured forth in an overwhelming tide of eloquence, like the swift, deep current of some mighty river, bearing down every obstacle to its passage. Scarcely less noticeable are the brilliance and fierceness of his invective. These qualities are perhaps most remarkably exhibited in some of the speeches on the Reform Bill; but in all his great political speeches there are passages which actually burn with the intensity of passion breathed into them. His incidental references to his opponents have the same intellectual fierceness and intolerance. Thus, in referring on one occasion to the party of the late Sir Robert Peel, he very summarily described them as "men whom posterity will remember by nothing but recantations";† and on a more recent occasion, Lord Maidstone has very foolishly shown how much his temper was ruffled by an incidental allusion to his unfortunate hexameters, in the address at Edinburgh.‡ But it is needless to multiply instances which will occur to every reader; for there is scarcely one of Mr. Macaulay's speeches in which his adversaries are not transfixed on some keen shaft of remorseless irony. And with all our admiration

\* The date of the first of these articles is erroneously given as January, 1827. It was actually published in June, 1827. The second article, we are inclined to think, was not written by Mr. Macaulay.

† Vol. I. p. 134.

‡ Vol. II. pp. 391, 392.

of his consummate genius, we feel compelled to observe, in this connection, that there is in his speeches, as there is in his writings, an occasional coarseness of expression only too familiar to the English mind.

In strength and fervor of imagination, he is the rival of that great master of eloquence, Edmund Burke. But it is less the imagination of the poet, as Milton described him, "soaring in the high reason of his fancy, with his garland and his singing robes about him," than the imagination of the statesman, reproducing before his mind the history of all the past and unfolding before his prophetic vision the probable history of future ages. It is best seen in some splendid picture of the actual or the possible evils of misgovernment, when the whole fabric of society shall be broken in pieces by too long an opposition to the progressive spirit of the times, and an age of barbarism succeed to an age of civilization, or in some magnificent glimpse of that glorious vista which the adoption of a desired reform will open to the gaze of all men. It vitalizes and vivifies the whole course of his argument, and fuses into one harmonious picture that lavish profusion of learning and illustration which he has ever at his command. All literature and all history appear to have been absorbed by his omnivorous mind; but under the plastic force of his imagination every illustration drops into its appropriate place. No speeches, indeed, can be freer from a useless and ostentatious display of erudition and from all the multiform vices of pedantry. But whilst his imagination has so large a share in determining the form of his argument and the illustrations by which it shall be strengthened, it rarely trenches upon the province of the intellect or leads him into errors of judgment. Akin to this constant, but chastened use of the imagination, and arising from it, is his preference of the concrete over the abstract. Though seizing in one comprehensive grasp every aspect of a subject, and with a remarkable habit of generalization, he rarely indulges in abstract forms of expression. His mind deals in images rather than in abstract ideas; but his images are pictorial generalizations with wide-extended relations rather than illustrations of a single proposition. It is this statement of general ideas in a concrete form which gives such picturesqueness and

force to his style, and so fastens the attention of the reader and the listener.

Quite distinct from these qualities are the closeness and cogency of his argumentation. We sometimes, indeed, meet with a sophism or an argument of doubtful weight. But in general his propositions are strongly, clearly, and exactly stated, and are bound together with the iron clamps of logic, like one of those massive piers on our Atlantic shores, within whose immovable weight the wind and wave-shattered vessel may repose in peace. It rarely happens that the exercise of a strong and fervid imagination is found united with great logical proficiency. Yet in the case of Mr. Macaulay it is not easy to determine whether the greater admiration should be felt at the lofty and sustained flights of his imagination, or at the repeated evidences of his dialectical skill. His premises and his conclusions are linked to each other by the rigid and unbending law of logical necessity; and his best speeches are unanswerable arguments for the cause which he advocates. The whole speech is knit and compacted into one solid and perfect piece of argumentative reasoning, whilst every part glows with the fire of his imagination, the brilliance of his wit, the bitterness of his sarcasm, and the wealth of his illustrations. Educated in the law, he was early imbued with those habits of acuteness and precision of thought which it is the great and crowning glory of legal studies to create and foster. But the very limited attention which he has since paid to that science of marvellous complexity has prevented his mind from being narrowed to the contemplation of a merely technical system of government. If, as Burke contended, George Grenville was unfitted by his early legal studies for the exercise of a lofty statesmanship, the same effect has not been seen in Mr. Macaulay.\* His study of history and general literature has made him a ripe scholar, without making him a pedant. His study of the law has made him a profound logician, without making him

---

\* It is perhaps needless to say, that that eminent man, so lately removed from the sight of this community, only to be held in a more cherished remembrance, was a remarkable exception to Burke's remark. In Mr. Webster we saw a union of great forensic talents with accomplished statesmanship, to which modern history furnishes no parallel.



a logical trickster. No fallacy or sophism in his adversary's chain of reasoning escapes his penetrating glance; and, on the other hand, if you accept his premises, you can rarely withhold your assent to his conclusions, as we have already intimated.

Though Mr. Macaulay is a remarkably independent thinker, and never accepts an opinion upon the authority of another man's judgment, his political opinions in general accord with those of the English Whigs, and he has always been known as a zealous partisan. Thus he said on one occasion, when referring to the manner in which the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington was conducted on the part of Lord Ashburton: "I said before, and I now repeat, that, instead of procuring for us the blessings and advantages of peace, the course pursued has every tendency to plunge us speedily into a war with America."\* And, in closing, he says: "Allowing, in the first instance, that the boundary line is not the only direct source of censure, I say that the negotiation generally has been conducted in such a manner as to lower the character of this country [England]. And secondly, I say that the negotiation has been so conducted, and the treaty has been so framed, that it has left one of the most serious causes of irritation more inflamed than before."† Certainly, such declarations as these, could have been dictated by nothing but a strong party feeling; and it would not be difficult to cite numerous other instances of the same sturdy partisanship. Yet Mr. Macaulay has on several occasions separated from a large portion of his party; and he has always been in favor of extending the number of what are called in England open questions, or questions about which the different members of the government are permitted to entertain and express contrary opinions, without being subject to dismissal by the prime minister. And this leads us to observe, that Mr. Macaulay's partisanship is seen rather in the vehemence with which he espouses any cause, than in a uniform advocacy of the measures of the party to which he is attached. Accordingly, we often find him deprecating the extent to which devotion to the interests of a party is sometimes carried.

---

\* Vol. II. p. 153.

† Ibid. p. 154.

At the same time, he does not deny the necessity of party organizations under a free government. His whole view of this subject of party connections is very clearly stated in a speech on the Ballot, delivered not long before the overthrow of the Melbourne ministry, a portion of which we cite. According to the report he said : —

“ He was perfectly aware that in Parliament it was impossible any thing great could be done without coöperation, and he was aware that there could be no coöperation without mutual compromise. He admitted, therefore, that men were justified, when united into a party, either in office or in opposition, in making mutual concessions, in opposing measures which they might, as individuals, think desirable, in assenting to those which they might consider objectionable, and giving their votes, not with reference to the mere terms of the question put from the chair, but with reference to the general state of political parties. All this he admitted. If there were any person who thought it wrong, he respected the tenderness of his conscience, but that person's vocation was not for a public life. That person should select a quieter path for his passage through life ; one in which he might play a useful and respectable part ; but he was as completely unfitted for the turmoils of political strife as a Quaker, by his religious principles, was prevented from undertaking the command of a regiment of horse. Thus far he admitted the principle of party combinations, but he admitted that they might be carried too far, — that they had been carried too far. That a member of the House should say, ‘ No,’ to a proposition which he believed to be essentially just and necessary, — that he should steadily vote through all its stages in favor of a bill that he believed would have pernicious consequences, — was conduct which he (Mr. Macaulay) should think was not to be defended. Such a course of action was not reconcilable to a plain man, whose notions of morality were not drawn from the casuists. He only defended the principle of mutual action among political partisans as being a peculiar exception from the great general rules of political morality, and it was clear, that an exception from the great rules of political morality should be most strictly construed, that it should not be needlessly extended, and, above all, that it should not be converted into the rule. Therefore, he said, that in the members of a government, any concession of opinion which was not necessary to the efficient conduct of affairs, to cordial coöperation, was to be looked upon as unjustifiable.” — Vol. I. pp. 293, 294.

Though endowed, as we have already seen, with a strong and healthy imagination, Mr. Macaulay is one of

the most practical and least theoretical of statesmen. With him no form of government is so good and so perfect as to be equally suited to all people, under all the varying circumstances of a nation's life.\* He even goes further, and declares: "I will not positively say that there is any form of polity which may not, under some conceivable circumstances, be the best possible."† In his view, indeed, government exists to promote the best interests of the governed, but it is a system of concessions and compromises, where theory must give way to expediency. "For the sake of the good," he says, "we must submit to the evil; but the evil ought not to last a day longer than is necessary for securing the good."‡ Hence he is disposed to take a middle course between the blind conservatism of the Tories on the one hand, and the headlong rashness of the Radicals on the other. "Let us shun extremes," is his doctrine, "not only because each extreme is in itself a positive evil, but also because it has been proved by experiment that each extreme necessarily engenders its opposite. If we love civil and religious freedom, let us in every day of danger uphold law and order. If we are zealous for law and order, let us prize as the best security of that law and order civil and religious freedom."§ This thoroughly practical character runs through all his speeches, and underlies all his political actions. Especially is it seen in his discussion of the Copyright question, and in his unsparing ridicule of that most ridiculous and futile of all arguments by which prohibitive duties, laid on slave-grown sugar to benefit the West India colonies, were afterwards advocated as a means of putting an end to slavery. "We do not deny its use," he remarks, "to the Canadians or to the people of the Cape of Good Hope; nay, we do not deny it to the inhabitants of these very West-Indian Islands. What, then, is this moral principle, this great general law of humanity and justice, which permits a man to wear slave-grown cotton on his feet, and not taste slave-grown sugar in his tea, — which permits him to smoke slave-grown tobacco, and denies him a palatable beverage to drink with it, —

---

\* Vol. I. p. 167.

† Ibid. p. 392.

‡ Ibid. p. 77.

§ Vol. II. pp. 388, 389.



rather, which permits him the enjoyment of a cup of slave-grown coffee, but does not allow him to sweeten it with slave-grown sugar? Nay, to make the absurdity more complete, which permits slave-grown sugar to be imported into Newfoundland and Barbadoes, and which declares it shall not be admitted into Yorkshire and Lancashire?"\* Thus does Mr. Macaulay bring every question to the test of a practical statesmanship; and it is this crowning quality of a statesman which has enabled him to unite so great distinction in politics with so great a literary fame.

Like nearly all the great practical statesmen of our time, he regards the security of property as the chief object for which governments are instituted. In one of his early speeches, he says, with something, indeed, of rhetorical exaggeration: "For the sake of the great institution of property, for which all other institutions exist, which is the source of all knowledge, and of all industry, I do most deeply lament to hear the sanctity that belongs to property claimed by that which is not property."† At a later period we find him adopting the same language on more than one occasion. In a debate on Church Reform in Ireland, according to Hansard's report, he argued to the following effect: "It had next been asserted that the rights of property had been attacked by this bill; this, he maintained, was an assertion; if it could be proved, he would give up the bill. The right of property was of immense importance. To preserve that, kings, and Parliaments, and coronation oaths, all existed. For that alone, law was made. Admitting the momentous nature of this consideration, he denied that the rights of property had been attacked by the framers of the bill."‡ And to this he adds, that the ministry "felt bound to defend to the utmost the institution of property, believing, as they did, that it was to that institution mankind were indebted for the origin and the progress of civilization, — believing that it was in consequence of that institution that we were not now, like our rude ancestors, naked and painted bodies, savages feeding upon acorns and sheltering ourselves in caves."§ But this regard for the institution of property

---

\* Vol. II. pp. 42, 43.

† Vol. I. pp. 233, 234.

‡ Vol. I. p. 94.

§ Ibid. p. 234.

is still more apparent in his uniform advocacy of those measures which tend to its security, or which render its acquisition more easy, than it is in any detached phrases and sentences which we might cite from his various speeches.

Thus, while his Whig leanings permit him to feel little sympathy for the aristocracy and the landed gentry, who have always formed the strength of the Tory party, all his sympathies are with the great commercial, literary, and professional classes; and he has always opposed universal suffrage, because it would throw the chief weight in the government into the hands of those who have but a slight interest in the protection of property. "In my opinion," he says, "a pecuniary qualification is indispensably necessary to the safety of the empire."\* And in his recent speech at Edinburgh, he says: "As to universal suffrage, — on that subject you already know my opinions, and I now come before you with those opinions strengthened by every thing which, since that period, has passed in Europe."† But though Mr. Macaulay repudiates universal suffrage, he has always been in favor of voting by ballot, — a system which, strangely enough, is even now opposed in England as one of the most deadly heresies that a statesman can profess. It is regarded, in fact, as something quite inseparable from universal suffrage, and the overthrow of every good institution.

Upon the subject of education and the diffusion of knowledge Mr. Macaulay's views are broad, liberal, and statesmanlike. He opposed Sergeant Talfourd's Copyright Bill vigorously and effectually, because he regarded it as liable greatly to increase the cost of books, and place other restrictions, even more objectionable, on the general diffusion of knowledge. He strongly advocated the increased grant to Maynooth College and the bill for opening the Scotch Universities to others than the members of the Established Church; and in 1847 he delivered one of his best speeches in favor of a general system of national education. "I hold," said he, on this occasion, "that it is the right and duty of the state to provide for the education of the common people."‡ And

---

\* Vol. I. p. 312.

† Vol. II. p. 398.

‡ Ibid. p. 329.

he concludes an argument in favor of the proposition "that the education of the common people is the most effectual means of protecting persons and property," by declaring as his deliberate conviction, "that the education of the people ought to be the first concern of a state, not only because it is an efficient means for promoting and obtaining that which all allow to be the main end of government, but because it is the most efficient, the most humane, the most civilized, and in all respects the best, means of attaining that end." \*

Mr. Macaulay has also always been an advocate of religious toleration. His first speech in Parliament was in favor of a bill for removing the civil disabilities of the Jews; and both through the press and from his place in Parliament he has advocated their rights. He has also constantly been in favor of the removal of all disabilities under which members of the Romish Church now labor, or under which they have labored at any time since his entrance upon public life. Nor did any one more ably support that just and merciful act, the Dissenters' Chapel Bill, which afforded so much relief to the members of our own denomination in England. Not an active or zealous member of any religious party, Mr. Macaulay has with a broad and comprehensive view advocated the rights of all. "For his own part," were his words in 1841, "he should say, that on every occasion in which an attempt was made in that House to take away any civil disability imposed upon men in consequence of their religious opinions, it should receive his most strenuous support." † By the principle involved in this declaration his whole Parliamentary course has been guided.

Passing now from this general survey of Mr. Macaulay's oratory and statesmanship, we propose, in conclusion, to offer a few remarks on some of his principal speeches, in further illustration of his political career. He entered Parliament, as is well known, in 1830, as a member for the borough of Calne, — a nomination-borough under the patronage of the Marquis of Lansdowne. His first speech was delivered in April of that year, and, as we have already remarked, was in favor of the bill for re-

---

\* Vol. II. p. 333.

† Ibid. p. 39.



moving the civil disabilities of the Jews. It was a brief but cogent argument in favor of the measure, though it exhibited little of the extraordinary brilliancy which has since marked his Parliamentary efforts, and gave, indeed, little promise of the eminence which he soon obtained. Still it is a very close, careful, and weighty argument, stated with great ingenuity, and well calculated to convince the understanding. In truth, its arguments on several points are quite unanswerable, particularly in those portions where he refutes the positions of the opponents of Jewish emancipation.

An occasion, however, soon arose, offering by far the best opportunity for a Parliamentary orator to obtain eminence which has arisen within the memory of this generation. On the 1st of March, 1831, Lord John Russell brought in the Reform Bill; and with its introduction commenced that great struggle between the Whigs and the Tories, unequalled since the days of Sir Robert Walpole, which lasted for more than a year, and finally terminated in the most important triumph of the liberal party which has been achieved in England since the Revolution. Into the discussion of this great measure Mr. Macaulay entered with unsurpassed spirit and energy. His first speech upon it was delivered on the second evening of the debate, and was in every respect deserving of the praise which Sir James Mackintosh bestowed on it, when he wrote that "Macaulay and Stanley have made two of the finest speeches ever spoken in Parliament."\* In closeness of argument, in keenness of wit, and in wealth of historical illustration, it is hardly inferior to any of his subsequent speeches, whilst it is also the model on which most of them are formed. As we have on a former occasion given several extracts from this speech,† we can now cite but a single passage, which shows, however, with admirable clearness and force, the nature of that struggle which then engaged all minds. Referring to the argument against disfranchising the small boroughs because they were as large then as they were when representation was granted them, he says:—

---

\* Letter to Miss Allen, *Memoirs*, Vol. II. p. 479.

† *Christian Examiner*, No. 160, Art. V.

“ We talk of the wisdom of our ancestors, — and in one respect at least they were wiser than we. They legislated for their own times. They looked at the England which was before them. They did not think it necessary to give twice as many members to York as they gave to London, because York had been the capital of Britain in the time of Constantius Chlorus ; and they would have been amazed indeed, if they had foreseen that a city of more than a hundred thousand inhabitants would be left without representatives in the nineteenth century, merely because it stood on ground which, in the thirteenth century, had been occupied by a few huts. They framed a representative system, which was not indeed without defects and irregularities, but which was well adapted to the state of England in their time. But a great revolution took place. The character of the old corporations changed. New forms of property came into existence. New portions of society rose into importance. There were in our rural districts rich cultivators, who were not freeholders. There were in our capital rich traders, who were not liverymen. Towns shrank into villages. Villages swelled into cities larger than the London of the Plantagenets. Unhappily, while the natural growth of society went on, the artificial polity continued unchanged. The ancient form of the representation remained ; and precisely because the form remained, the spirit departed. Then came that pressure almost to bursting, — the new wine in the old bottles, — the new people under the old institutions. It is now time for us to pay a decent, a rational, a manly reverence to our ancestors, — not by superstitiously adhering to what they, under other circumstances, did, but by doing what they, in our circumstances, would have done. All history is full of revolutions, produced by causes similar to those which are now operating in England. A portion of the community which had been of no account expands and becomes strong. It demands a place in the system, suited, not to its former weakness, but to its present power. If this is granted, all is well. If this is refused, then comes the struggle between the young energy of one class, and the ancient privileges of another. Such was the struggle between the Plebeians and the Patricians of Rome. Such was the struggle of the Italian allies for admission to the full rights of Roman citizens. Such was the struggle of our North American colonies against the mother country. Such was the struggle which the *Tiers Etat* of France maintained against the aristocracy of birth. Such was the struggle which the Catholics of Ireland maintained against the aristocracy of creed. Such is the struggle which the free people of color in Jamaica are now maintaining against the aristocracy of skin. Such, finally, is the struggle which the middle classes in England are maintaining

against an aristocracy of mere locality, — against an aristocracy, the principle of which is to invest a hundred drunken potwallopers in one place, or the owner of a ruined hovel in another, with powers which are withheld from cities renowned to the farthest ends of the earth for the marvels of their wealth and of their industry." — Vol. I. pp. 81, 82.

But Mr. Macaulay's exertions in behalf of Reform did not end with this magnificent plea. During the discussion of the three successive bills he delivered eight speeches, each of which is a masterpiece of persuasive and convincing oratory. Taken together, they constitute one of the most remarkable series of speeches ever delivered upon any one subject. Nothing which the most complete mastery of dialectics, the most brilliant imagination, the fiercest invective, or the greatest command of historical illustrations can impart, is wanting to their complete success. Admirable as were the speeches of Lord John Russell and Mr. Stanley (the present Earl of Derby) in the House of Commons, and of Earl Grey in the Upper House, these speeches of Mr. Macaulay will lose little by a comparison with the best of them. It is not easy, nor is it necessary to our present purpose, to determine the relative rank of his different speeches delivered at this time; but we are inclined to give the preference to the speech on the third reading of the second Reform Bill, in September, 1831, and to that on the third reading of the third bill, in March, 1832.

In 1832 he was chosen a member of the First Reformed Parliament, for the great manufacturing city of Leeds; but upon the passage of the bill renewing and altering the charter of the East India Company, he was appointed to an important position at Calcutta, and soon after vacated his seat and proceeded to India. Previously to his appointment, however, he delivered a very able speech on the general affairs of the country, two powerful speeches on Irish questions, and that splendid speech on the East India Charter, which for the brilliancy of its historical pictures and the wonderful minuteness of its research stands unrivalled amongst the great efforts of his Parliamentary life. Indeed, few persons who have read it will think its merits were exaggerated either by Lord Jeffrey or Lord Canterbury, when the former wrote to his friend and biographer, Lord Cockburn: "Mac.



is a marvellous person. He made the very best speech that has been made this session on India, a few nights ago, to a House of less than fifty. The Speaker, who is a severe judge, says he rather thinks it the best speech he ever heard."\* In it the orator first traces with transcendent ability the history of the East India possessions, and of the connection of the East India Company with them, and then passes to a most careful and statesman-like explanation of the provisions which it was proposed should be ingrafted on the new charter. One or two extracts will afford our readers an idea of the manner in which the subject is treated. Referring to the political power of the Company he says:—

"It is true that the power of the Company is an anomaly in politics. It is strange—very strange—that a joint-stock society of traders,—a society, the shares of which are daily passed from hand to hand,—a society, the component parts of which are perpetually changing,—a society, which, judging *à priori* from its constitution, we should have said was as little fitted for imperial functions as the Merchant Tailors' Company or the New River Company,—should be intrusted with the sovereignty of a larger population, the disposal of a larger clear revenue, the command of a larger army, than are under the direct management of the executive government of the United Kingdom. But what constitution can we give to our Indian empire which shall not be strange,—which shall not be anomalous? That empire is of itself the strangest of all political anomalies. That a handful of adventurers from an island in the Atlantic should have subjugated a vast country divided from the place of their birth by half the globe,—a country which at no very distant period was merely the subject of fable to the nations of Europe,—a country never before violated by the most renowned of Western conquerors,—a country which Trajan never entered,—a country lying beyond the point where the phalanx of Alexander refused to proceed;—that we should govern a country ten thousand miles from us,—a territory larger and more populous than France, Spain, Italy, and Germany put together,—a territory, the present clear revenue of which exceeds the present clear revenue of any state in the world, France excepted,—a territory inhabited by men differing from us in race, color, language, manners, morals, religion;—these are prodigies to which the world has seen nothing similar. Reason is confounded. We interrogate the past in vain. General rules are

---

\* Life of Lord Jeffrey (American edition), Vol. II. p. 206.

almost useless where the whole is one vast exception. The Company is an anomaly ; but it is part of a system where every thing is [an] anomaly. It is the strangest of all governments ; but it is designed for the strangest of all empires." — Vol. I. pp. 255, 256.

In another part of the speech, when defending the manner in which certain appointments were to be made, he incidentally offers some very just remarks on the general subject of education. He observes :—

"It is said, I know, that examinations in Latin, in Greek, and in mathematics are no tests of what men will prove to be in life. I am perfectly aware that they are not infallible tests ; but that they are tests I confidently maintain. Look at every walk of life, — at this House, — at the other House, — at the Bar, — at the Bench, — at the Church, — and see whether it be not true, that those who attain high distinction in the world are generally men who were distinguished in their academic career. Indeed, Sir, this objection would prove far too much even for those who use it. It would prove, that there is no use at all in education. Why should we put boys out of their way ? Why should we force a lad, who would much rather fly a kite or trundle a hoop, to learn his Latin grammar ? Why should we keep a young man to his Thucydides or his Laplace, when he would much rather be shooting ? Education would be mere useless torture, if, at two or three and twenty, a man who has neglected his studies were exactly on a par with a man who has applied himself to them, — exactly as likely to perform all the offices of public life with credit to himself and with advantage to society. Whether the English system be good or bad is not now the question. Perhaps I may think that too much time is given to the ancient languages, and to the abstract sciences. But what then ? Whatever be the languages, whatever be the sciences, which it is, in any age or country, the fashion to teach, those who become the greatest proficient in those languages and those sciences will generally be the flower of the youth, — the most acute, — the most industrious, — the most ambitious of honorable distinctions. If the Ptolemaic system were taught at Cambridge, instead of the Newtonian, the senior wrangler would nevertheless be in general a superior man to the wooden spoon. If, instead of learning Greek, we learned the Cherokee, the man who understood the Cherokee the best, who made the most correct and melodious Cherokee verses, who comprehended most accurately the effect of the Cherokee particles, would generally be a superior man to him who was destitute of these accomplishments. If astrology were taught at our universities, the young man who cast nativities

best, would generally turn out a superior man. If alchemy were taught, the young man who showed most activity in the pursuit of the philosopher's stone would generally turn out a superior man." — Vol. I. pp. 267–269.

In 1838, Mr. Macaulay returned to England, and was soon after elected to Parliament from Edinburgh. Having joined the Melbourne Ministry, as Secretary at War, he took an active part in all the debates which marked the close of that administration. His principal speeches previous to its overthrow were upon Irish questions, which he has invariably discussed with striking ability, on the ballot, the war with China, and in opposition to Sergeant Talfourd's Copyright Bill. His speech on this subject in particular is one which can scarcely be too highly praised, whether we consider the unanswerable weight of its arguments, the exceeding appropriateness of the illustrations by which they are enforced, or the liberal and just spirit which animates it. But the most powerful speech that he ever delivered, we think, is that delivered in January, 1840, upon confidence in the ministry. It unites in larger measure than any of his other speeches those peculiar qualities to which he owes his reputation as a statesman and orator. We extract two historical pictures drawn with wonderful power and skill. Arguing that Sir Robert Peel, if he should succeed in displacing the Melbourne Ministry, would lose the support of one portion of his own party and would not gain the support of the other so as to construct a strong administration, he retraces the history of the Wellington and Peel Ministry in the following eloquent passage:—

"Sir, we have not to act in this merely upon conjecture. We have beheld the same piece performed on the same scene, and by the same actors, at no distant period. In 1827, the Right Hon. Baronet was, as now, at the head of a powerful opposition. He had a strong minority in this House, and a majority in the House of Lords; he was the idol of the Church and of the Universities; and all those who dreaded change, all those who were hostile to the principles of liberty and the rights of conscience, considered him their leader; he was opposed to those members who were sometimes called Papists, and sometimes idolaters; he was opposed to a government which was said to have obtained power by personal intrigue and court favor. At last the Right Hon. Baronet rises to the principal place in this



House. Free from those difficulties which had embarrassed him, he was in opposition when Tory bigotry had found for the greatest orator, and the most accomplished of Tory statesmen in the nineteenth century, a resting-place in Westminster Abbey, and the Right Hon. Baronet appeared at the head of government upon this bench, and those who had raised him to power with the loudest acclamations deemed that their expectations must necessarily be accomplished. Is it necessary to say in what disappointment, in what sorrow, in what fury, all those expectations ended? The Right Hon. Baronet had been raised to power by prejudices and by passions in which he had no share. His followers were bigots; he was a statesman. He was calmly balancing conveniences and inconveniences, whilst they were ready to prefer confiscation, proscription, civil war, to the smallest concession to public feeling. The Right Hon. Baronet attempted to stand well with his party, and at the same time to perform some part of his duty to his country. Vain effort! His elevation, as it had excited the hopes and expectations of his own party, awakened gloomy apprehensions in other quarters. Agitation in Ireland, which for a time had slumbered, awakened with renewed vigor, and became more formidable than ever. The Roman Catholic Association rose to a height of power such as the Irish Parliament in the days of its independence never possessed. Violence engendered violence; scenes such as the country for long years had not witnessed, announced that the time of evasion and delay was passed. A crisis was arrived, in which it was absolutely necessary for the government of the day to take one part or the other. A plain and simple issue was proposed to the Right Hon. Baronet, — either to disgust his party or ruin his country. He chose the good path; he performed a painful, in some sense a humiliating, but in point of fact a most truly honorable part. He came down himself to propose to this House the great measure of Roman Catholic Emancipation. Amongst the followers of the Right Hon. Baronet, there were some, who, like himself, had considered opposition to the Catholic claims purely as a matter of expediency. These readily changed about, and consented to support his altered policy. But not so the great body of those who had previously followed the Right Hon. Baronet. With them opposition to the Roman Catholics was a passion, which a mistaken sense of duty bound them to cherish. They had been deceived, and it would have been more agreeable for them to think that they had been deceived by others than one of their own sect, — one whom they themselves had been the means of raising to a permanent place in the administration of the country. How profound was their indignation! With what an explosion did their rage break forth! None

who saw that time can ever forget the frantic fury with which the former associates of the Right Hon. Baronet assailed their quondam chief. Never was such a torrent of invective and calumny directed against one single head. All history and all fiction were ransacked by his own followers to furnish terms of abuse and obloquy. The Right Hon. gentleman, whom I am sorry not now to see in his place on the bench opposite, unable to express his feelings in the language of English prose, pursued his late chief with reproaches drawn from the writings of the deserted Dido. Another, wresting to his use the page of holy writ, likened him to Judas Iscariot. The great University, which heretofore had been proud to confer upon him the highest marks of its favor, was now foremost to fix upon him the brand of disgrace and infamy. Men came up in crowds from [to] Oxford to vote against him, whose presence a few days before would have set the bells of all their churches jingling. The whole hatred of the High Church party towards those to whom they had previously been opposed, was sunk and absorbed in this new aversion; and thence it happened that the Ministry, which in the beginning of 1828 was one of the strongest that the country ever saw, was at the end of 1829 one of the weakest that a political opponent could desire to combat. It lingered on another year, struggling between two parties, leaning now on the Whigs, now on the Tories, — reeling sometimes beneath a blow from the right, sometimes from a blow on the left, — certain to fall as soon as the two parties should unite in their efforts to defeat it. At last it fell, attacked by the whole body of the Church, and of the Tory gentry in England. Now, what I wish to know is this: What reason have we to believe, that, from an administration now formed by the Right Hon. Baronet, we could [can] anticipate any different result? — Vol. I. pp. 320 – 322.

To this singularly condensed and vivid historical sketch we need add but a single extract. Contrasting Ireland under Tory rule, and Ireland under the Whigs, he uses the following language, hardly, if in any degree, inferior in brilliancy of description to the passage which we have just quoted: —

“It is upon these grounds, and principally upon the question of Ireland, that I should be inclined to rest the case of the present Ministry. I know well, how little chance there is of finding here or anywhere an unprejudiced audience upon this subject. Would to God that I were speaking to an audience that would judge this great controversy fairly, and with an unbiassed mind, and as it will be judged by future ages. The passions which inflame us, the sophistries which delude us, will not last for

ever. The paroxysms of faction have their appointed season; even the madness of fanaticism is but for a day. The time is coming when our conflicts will be to others as the conflicts of our forefathers are to us; when our priests who convulse the state, our politicians who make a stalking-horse of the Church, will be no more than the Harleys and Sacheverells of a by-gone day; and when will be told, in a language very different from that which now draws forth applause at Exeter Hall, the story of these troubled years. Then it will be said that there was a portion of the empire which presented a striking contrast to a portion of the rest. Not that it was doomed to sterility, for the soil was fruitful and well watered,—not that it wanted facilities for commerce and trade, for its coasts abounded in havens marked by nature to be the marts of the whole world,—not that the people were too proud to improve these advantages, or too pusillanimous to defend them, for in endurance of toil and gallantry of spirit they were conspicuous amongst the nations,—but the bounty of nature was rendered unavailable from the tyranny of man. In the twelfth century this fair country was a conquered province, the nineteenth found it a conquered province still. During the interval many great changes took place in other parts of the empire, conducing in the highest degree to the happiness and welfare of mankind; but to Ireland they brought only aggravation and misery. The Reformation came, bringing with it the blessings of Divine truth and intellectual liberty. To Ireland it brought only religious animosity, to add flame and fuel to the heats of national animosity, and to give in the name of 'Papist' another war-cry to animate the struggle between England and Ireland. The Revolution came, bringing to England and Scotland civil and religious liberty,—to Ireland it brought only persecution and degradation. In 1829 came Catholic Emancipation, but it came too late, and came too ungraciously,—it came as a concession made to fear; it was not followed nor accompanied by a suitable line of policy. It had excited many hopes,—it was followed by disappointment. Then came irritation and a host of perils on both sides. If agitation produced coercion, coercion gave rise to fresh agitation; the difficulties and danger of the country thickened on every hand, until at length arose a government which, all other means having failed, determined to try the only means that have never yet been fairly and fully applied to Ireland,—humanity and justice. The state, so long the step-mother of the many, and the mother only of the few, became now the common parent of all the great family. The great body of the people began to look upon the government as a kind and beneficent parent. Battalion after battalion, squadron after squadron, was withdrawn from the shores



of Ireland; yet every day property became more secure, and order more manifest. Such symptoms as cannot be counterfeited—such as cannot be disguised—began to appear; and those who once despaired of that great portion of the commonwealth began to entertain a confident hope that it would at length take its place among the nations of Europe, and assume that position to which it is entitled by its own natural resources, and by the wit and talent of its children. This, I feel, the history of the present government of Ireland will one day prove.” — Vol. I. pp. 328–330.

The storm which awoke such magnificent bursts of eloquence temporarily subsided; and the Melbourne Ministry contrived to drag out a lingering and impotent existence for another year. Upon its overthrow Sir Robert Peel became head of the government, and Mr. Macaulay ranged himself as one of the principal leaders of the Whig opposition. During the six years in which he occupied this position, he delivered a large number of speeches, sometimes upon subjects not strictly of a political nature, sometimes in cordial support of measures to which Sir Robert Peel could not rally his own supporters, and sometimes in fierce opposition to the government. Several of them are among the finest and ablest speeches which he ever delivered. But we have already entered so fully into his characteristics as an orator, and his principles as a statesman, that it would only needlessly extend this article to give a particular estimate of each. A very brief notice of a few of them is all that seems to be required.

Of the non-political speeches, that in opposition to Lord Mahon's Copyright Bill is doubtless the ablest; and though it is especially devoted to exhibiting the defects of that bill, its statement of the general principles which should be followed in the enactment of any law for the protection of authors, is remarkably clear, concise, and weighty. The speech on the Income Tax, delivered only a few days afterwards, was a bold, vigorous, and well-considered attack on the ministerial scheme, which possesses, however, little of permanent value or interest. Another speech, similar in its character, but of even greater ability than this, is his fierce attack on the Indian policy of Lord Ellenborough, as shown in his Lordship's proclamations, and in his proceedings in re-

gard to the restoration of the temple of Somnauth. The speech upon the Treaty of Washington, as we have already intimated, is one that does little credit to the orator's candor and fairness, though it is an ingenious assault on the foreign policy of the government. The speeches upon Ireland, in July, 1843, and February, 1844, exhibit those broad, clear views, and that thorough acquaintance with the history of the subject, which so largely characterize his Irish speeches. Indeed, if we were to select those speeches of Mr. Macaulay which would give an ordinary reader the best idea of his powers, we should award the preference to those on Irish questions and to those in which Ireland is the principal topic, next after the speeches upon the Reform Bill. The speech in favor of the Dissenters' Chapel Bill, to which allusion has already been made, besides an admirable elucidation of the particular reasons to be urged in favor of that most just and honorable measure, contains some very ingenious and weighty arguments against religious intolerance in general, which show how deeply seated are Mr. Macaulay's opinions on this subject. And a similar remark will apply with equal force to the two speeches in favor of the increased grant to Maynooth College, and to the speech on the Scotch Universities, delivered in the following year. The same liberal and enlightened views are also apparent in the masterly speech in favor of the government plan of education, of which Mr. Macaulay was one of the most zealous and efficient supporters. This speech, with the exception of some able but, as we think, unsound observations on affairs in Portugal, ends the list of his oratorical triumphs during his second term of Parliamentary service.

The earnest support which he had given to the Maynooth College grant had aroused the fears of the stiff and bigoted Presbyterians of Scotland, many of whom doubtless remembered with indignation his hearty advocacy of the Dissenters' Chapel Bill. Consequently, in 1847, he failed of a reelection from Edinburgh; and though it would have been easy for him, a cabinet minister, to obtain a place in Parliament, he determined to forsake public life. "I have quitted politics," he said in a very able speech at Glasgow in 1849, which we regret

is not included in the collection before us. "I quitted them without one feeling of resentment, without one feeling of regret, and betook myself to pursuits for which my temper and my tastes, I believe, fitted me better. I would not willingly believe that, in ceasing to be a politician, I relinquish altogether the power of rendering any service to my country. I hope it may still be in my power to teach lessons which may be profitable to those who still remain on the busy stage which I have left." It was well in this hour of defeat that the statesman was also a man of letters, and that, in the retirement which he now sought, he could "resume with alacrity a task under the magnitude and importance of which he had sometimes felt his mind ready to sink."

But there were many in that ancient capital, which to its historical renown has in our time added so great a literary fame, who keenly felt the stain inflicted upon their fair name by the rejection of one, who, above most men, unites a splendid literary reputation with political eminence; and they determined to wipe off the reproach. They have done so nobly and generously. In the general election of last year, Mr. Macaulay was triumphantly elected, without any solicitation on his part, or any previous address to the electors, such as it is the custom of candidates for Parliament to make in exposition of their views and principles. The whole proceeding was alike honorable to the citizens of Edinburgh and complimentary to Mr. Macaulay himself. And now he has entered, under happy omens, upon his third term of political service, with a brilliant future opening before him. But it will be matter of profound regret to every lover of literature, if his devotion to the honorable duties of a manly statesmanship shall lead him to sacrifice any part of that immortal fame which awaits him as the historian of England.

C. C. S.



## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*Hippolytus and his Age : or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus ; and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared.* By CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN. 4 vols. Post 8vo. pp. 352, 359, 384, 512.

THESE volumes present to us a sketch of the doctrine, ritual, discipline, and practice of the Christian Church in the earliest part of the third century. The materials for the sketch are drawn chiefly from an ancient book, discovered in 1842 by a Greek whom M. Villemain sent to Mount Athos in search of literary treasures. The manuscript, one of a large collection, was written in the fourteenth century, on cotton paper, and was registered as a treatise "On all Heresies." For two or three years it lay almost unnoticed in the great National Library, until M. Emanuel Miller, an officer in that institution, and an eminent Greek scholar, was attracted by some fragments it contained of Pindar and another lyric poet who was unknown. His curiosity was awakened ; and on further examination of the work, M. Miller concluded that it was a treatise of Origen, long supposed to have been lost. As such he offered it, in 1850, to the University Press at Oxford, where it was generously printed and published in 1851. A more complete and accurate edition, under the superintendence of M. Miller, will soon be published in Paris.

This work M. Bunsen believes to be the genuine production of Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, — the new harbor of the Tiber opposite Ostia, — and an eminent member of the Roman Presbytery. He lived about the year 225, and was consequently not very far removed from the Apostolical age, being the pupil of Irenæus, whose teacher, Polycarp of Ephesus, was the immediate disciple of the Apostle John. Of his life, or his death by martyrdom, very little is known. But the students of Christian antiquities have long been familiar with his name ; and it is natural enough that the question of his authorship should give rise to much discussion.

The first volume of M. Bunsen's book contains, in five letters to Archdeacon Hare, a critical inquiry into the genuineness of the newly discovered treatise, an extended analysis of its contents, and an examination into the authenticity of other writings ascribed to Hippolytus, with an account of the theological and ecclesiastical character of his age. The second volume opens with a series of "Aphorisms on the Philosophy of the History of

Mankind, and in particular on the History of Religion"; to which succeed, "Historical Fragments on the Life and Consciousness of the Ancient Church, and of the Age of Hippolytus in particular," with a double appendix, "On the Christian Sacrifice," and "On the Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles." Volume third presents to us, "The Life of the Ancient Church, by Education, Baptism, and Worship, in Government and Social Relations." In the fourth volume the results of the previous investigations are repeated in the form of an "Apology" which St. Hippolytus is supposed to address to the people of England, one thousand six hundred and sixteen years after his martyrdom. The whole is then concluded by a collection of the genuine Liturgies of the ancient Church. This general summary does not convey the least idea of the manifold contents of these volumes, every one of which is a treasury of learning and thought of the most varied kind. The work is sadly wanting in unity; the several portions hang loosely together; it abounds in repetitions. But we cannot withhold our admiration of the research, the sagacity, the minute and careful scholarship, which the author has displayed. M. Bunsen is not wholly free from theological prepossessions. Portions of the book have a polemical tone, which is ill suited to a grave historical inquiry. At times it seems as if he used the treatise of the old Roman Bishop to give a show of authority to his own religious opinions. But this may be harsh judgment. M. Bunsen is no vulgar partisan; he treats all with an equal freedom. On the one hand, he speaks with heartiest indignation of the Tübingen school of criticism; on the other, he speaks almost disrespectfully of the "candid and judicious Lardner," whose system "was built on the worst parts of Eusebius's history and the conventual sayings of Jerome,"—whose "view centres in the unhistorical and unreasonable assumption, that every canonical book must be supposed to be written by an Apostle in order to possess Apostolic authority."

It must be apparent on first sight that a treatise by Hippolytus "On all Heresies," must have many interesting bearings. We can barely allude to one or two of these.

1. M. Bunsen attaches great importance to the testimony it gives in favor of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel. For some years past, eminent scholars of the Tübingen school have labored with alarming signs of success to show that the Gospel of John could not have been written before the year 165 or 170. External evidence to the contrary was too weak to resist their relentless criticism; internal evidence was claimed as in their favor. Now M. Bunsen tells us that the treatise of Hippolytus contains quotations of Basilides from this Gospel, as early as the year 120. He does not cite the passages for his readers' benefit, but

for himself he has no doubt that the hypothesis of Baur and Schweigler is demolished. This may be so; we trust it is. It must be remembered, however, that we have not Basilides himself in 117, but only Hippolytus's report of Basilides in 255; we must allow, too, for possible misinterpretation of language; and, above all, we must not fail to notice M. Bunsen's frank confession here, that "the text is full of corruptions and difficulties."

2. In regard to doctrine, the views of St. Hippolytus, this distinguished Bishop of Rome, would be eminently unsatisfactory to almost all modern orthodox believers. The Athanasian Trinity he could not have comprehended; had it existed in his day, he would doubtless have classed it as the 33d heresy, or possibly as the first. The Nicene Trinity would not have been quite intelligible to him. In the Sabellian theory he might have recognized a resemblance to his own. Yet was he no Sabellian; for although his formulas were worded like those of Sabellius, his theological position was very different. Neither was St. Hippolytus an Arian; and far less was he a Humanitarian. His doctrine respecting Christ was little more than an amplification of the proem to the fourth Gospel. God is the Logos, or Eternal Reason, which becomes incarnate in the Son. The personality of the Son is *out of* the Logos; the Holy Spirit has no personality.

3. By far the most interesting and elaborate portion of the work before us relates to the Christian ordinances. By the rite of Baptism the believer or convert was received into the Church. Three years of instruction and preparation were necessary ere this final step could be taken, and the ceremony was preceded by a public confession of faith, and by a solemn pledge "for life and death" to live for God and one's neighbor, not for the world and self. The examination of candidates touching their character, occupation, and even their physical condition, was very strict. The slave, even of a heathen, must bear a good reputation for honesty and purity of conduct. The master of slaves must give his servants, of both sexes, an opportunity of entering into married life, and must forbid all immoral connections. The harlot must leave her harlotry, and the maintainer of harlots his infamous trade. Soldiers were admitted on similar conditions to those prescribed by John the Baptist. Of course, under such circumstances, baptism was administered only to adults, who were capable of moral determination, and were responsible for it. "Pedobaptism, in the more modern sense," says M. Bunsen, "meaning thereby baptism of newborn infants, with the vicarious promises of parents or other sponsors, was utterly unknown to the early Church; not only down to the end of the second, but indeed to the middle of the third century." The pledge was made intelligently and freely. The keeping it was the condition



of continuance in the Church ; its infringement entailed repentance or excommunication.

We should despair of giving, in a few words, the Eucharistic doctrine that prevailed at this early period ; a subject upon which M. Bunsen dwells at very great length. Let it suffice to say, that this ceremonial act "was the thankful sacrifice of self, a vow which was to be pledged here, to be sealed in the Lord's Supper, and realized by continual struggle in life to promote the kingdom of God." The bread and wine were symbols. "The internal action was the sacrifice on the part of the Church, in gratitude for the mercies and blessings of God, with especial thankful remembrance of the sacrificial death of Jesus." This view is repeated in all parts of M. Bunsen's work, and is justified by a vast amount of learning. In respect to public worship, it is interesting to know that it was free and simple, wholly wanting in what we call liturgical forms. The Pater Noster was the only prescribed prayer, and that was used statedly at the Communion alone. "The idea of reading prayers seems to have been particularly abhorrent to the ancient Church at this solemn time." The sermon was an extemporaneous performance. Psalms were sung from psalm-books. There was liberty of teaching and praying in the congregation ; for the Spirit was given to every believer.

4. No form of Episcopacy is countenanced by Hippolytus. He was no Papist. He acknowledged "no divine right in the Bishop of Rome to decide all doctrinal questions, and to govern Christendom either by his own decisions, or by his privilege of confirming or annulling the decrees of Councils." He even places the Roman Church in distinct opposition to the "Catholic Church." The Church was the Christian people ; the bishops merely bore witness to the Spirit which the Apostles received ; it was not their exclusive gift. There was no Levitical priesthood in the Church ; its ministers exercised no mediatorial function. Still, "in the time of Callistus, the power of the Bishop of Rome was already more absolute than constitutional." "Although legislation was vested in a collegiate body, — in the presbytery or the body of presbyters, presided over by the bishop, — and the judicial power entirely so, the real government of the Church was in the hands of the bishop." Steps were even taken towards the celibacy of the clergy. A presbyter who lost his wife could not marry again so long as he kept the office. He who had a second or third wife ought not to be made a presbyter. No unmarried presbyter could, during his office, be married.

Such are only a few of the points upon which the treatise of St. Hippolytus, or rather M. Bunsen, speaking in the name of St. Hip-

polytus, throws light. Could we be certain that this manuscript was the genuine production of so eminent a person, and that its text was reasonably pure, we should agree with M. Bunsen in regarding it as one of the most valuable monuments of early Christianity. But we wish the argument in the first volume were a little more conclusive than we find it. M. Bunsen makes it satisfactorily clear that the book was not written by Origen or Caius. The evidence of its being the work of Hippolytus is not so full. Here is the proof. 1. A work bearing the same title is mentioned as the writing of Hippolytus, by Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria. 2. Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, speaks distinctly of a book of this character by Hippolytus, in his "*Bibliotheca*." His description of the work corresponds, in several particulars, with the newly found treatise. The author follows the same arrangement as that indicated by Photius, the heresies succeed each other in like order, and end with the Noetians. The book, like that which Photius read, contains the enumeration and refutation of just thirty-two heresies; and, finally, in conformity with Photius's account, is based upon a writing of Irenæus, of which it is an enlargement. This evidence is certainly strong, if it is not conclusive. But there are one or two weak places which the Chevalier, with all his learning and ingenuity, can neither conceal nor fortify. The work mentioned by Photius began with the Dositheans, whereas our treatise commences the list of heresies with the Naasseni, and does not name the Dositheans at all. According to Photius, Hippolytus in his book calls in question the genuineness of the Epistle to the Hebrews. M. Bunsen's manuscript has no reference to Hebrews whatever. Moreover, Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, quotes in his letter a passage from Hippolytus, about the heresy of the Quartodecimani, which nowhere appears in the text as we have it. Nor is this all the difficulty. The Cathedral upon which the statue of St. Hippolytus is seated bears inscribed a catalogue of his writings: therein is *not* contained this treatise on the Heresies. All these objections the learned author endeavors with much erudition to meet, bringing the power of conjecture to aid the weakness of proof. Would that he had convinced us as firmly as he has convinced himself. On the whole, however, we are inclined to believe that a genuine work of Hippolytus has been discovered; but until its authenticity is made more manifest, no considerable weight can be attached to its contents.

Even if we could grant all that M. Bunsen claims, that an undoubted writing of Hippolytus has come to light, it is evident, from his own frequent confessions, as well as from his numerous conjectural emendations, that the present text must be ex-

ceedingly corrupt. From the work before us, it might be inferred that it was too corrupt for restoration. Under this impression, we cannot anticipate any great results from the new discovery. All we dare to hope is, that it may provoke a new and thorough discussion of the important matters it suggests. There are those who heartily pray that the noble author may be in the right, and may be able to defend the right.

- 
1. *Two Sermons preached before the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society in Boston, on the 14th and 21st of November, 1852, on leaving their Old and entering a New Place of Worship.* By THEODORE PARKER. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co.
  2. *Branches and Garments. Two Modes of honoring Christ. A Sermon.* By HASBROUCK DAVIS. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co.

THESE sermons are noticeable, because they are intended to be an exposition of the views held by their authors respecting the authority of the Christian religion. On this point Mr. Parker's position may be understood from the following declarations: —

"I do not believe there ever was a miracle, or ever will be; everywhere I find law, — the constant mode of operation of the infinite God. I do not believe in the miraculous inspiration of the Old Testament or the New Testament. I do not believe that the Old Testament was God's first word, nor the New Testament his last. The Scriptures are no finality to me. . . . I do not believe the miraculous origin of the Hebrew Church, or the Buddhist Church, or the Christian Church; nor the miraculous character of Jesus. I take not the Bible for my master, nor yet the Church; nor even Jesus of Nazareth for my master. I feel not at all bound to believe what the Church says is true, nor what any writer in the Old or New Testament declares true. . . . He [Jesus] is my best historic ideal of human greatness; not without errors, not without the stain of his times, and, I presume, of course not without sins; for men without sins exist in the dreams of girls, not in real fact: you never saw such a one, nor I, and we never shall."

Mr. Davis expresses his views on the subject of Christ's mission and authority in these terms: —

"Christ was a man, tried in all points, yet superior to temptation. As a man he lived like other men, though of his personal history we can know but little. As a man he wrought no miracles. He neither healed the sick, nor did his voice ever transcend that bourne whence no traveller returns. . . . He is no Mediator. The race, with its upspringing affections and its clear-eyed reverence, wants and will have none."

In a note he adds: —

"An absolute miracle is an absolute impossibility. . . . We who



understand the unity of nature, and that all things come from God, ought therefore to understand the impossibility of miracles, as recorded in the sacred and other histories."

This language is so explicit, that it can hardly be misunderstood by those who wish to understand it. It is intended to be a disavowal of faith in the supernatural authority of the Christian religion. Both Mr. Parker and Mr. Davis publish these expositions of their views, because they do not wish to be classed among those who believe in the supernatural endowments or authority of Christ, and because they wish their true position to be understood.

In these sermons, of course, much more is said, and often well said, on many other topics. Surprise is sometimes expressed that those who reject the authority of Christianity should give utterance to so many Christian ideas. On the contrary, it would be surprising if the main part of their ideas on moral subjects were not in harmony with Christianity. Though rejecting the religion, their authors have grown up amidst Christian institutions, have been trained under Christian influences, have breathed an atmosphere made vital with Christian ideas, and formed their own habits, we suppose, while believers in the authority of Christ. The notions of God, of man, of duty and futurity, received into the mind of childhood, probably still remain, though their early faith in the Great Teacher is gone; as light remains in the sky long after the sun has sunk below the horizon. Such men, educated under Christian influences, are not, so far as character is concerned, the proper representatives of unbelief. The moral consequences which must result from the rejection of Christianity cannot be seen, till a generation grows up under the training of scepticism.

For whatever is valuable in these sermons their authors are indebted to Christianity. That which is peculiar to them is not that they state many truths and duties, but that, in teaching others, they reject the authority of the religion to which they themselves owe their best ideas of truth and duty. They cut away the roots of the tree which has borne good fruit for themselves, and expect that the sapless trunk will still go on bearing fruit abundantly for others. They undermine the corner-stone of the home that has sheltered them, and expect that the walls will stand as strong as ever for the shelter of their children.

It is not, however, our purpose to discuss the merits of their views, but merely to state them. To understand them, it should be observed that the object with the authors of these sermons is not chiefly to lop off dead branches from the living tree of Christianity, nor to free our faith from corruptions which may have accumulated around it. The one sole distinctive point of any importance in their opinions, the one which characterizes their

position, is the fact that they reject all claims which Christianity makes to a supernatural origin or authority. Christ claimed to be a teacher specially sent from God. This claim they deny. He professed to work miracles. They repudiate all such pretensions. If they call him inspired, it is only in the same sense in which every man is inspired. They may attribute to him great excellence of character, but they consider the record from which alone we have knowledge of his character as full of fables. They think his moral system admirable, but it is solely because it agrees with their own judgment of what is right. Mr. Parker freely and heartily admits that Christ taught many great truths of religion, though he believes that he fell into serious mistakes on important points. The respect, however, expressed for Christ's teachings is founded, not on any peculiar authority attributed to the Saviour, but on the fact that his teachings are found by Mr. Parker to accord with his own opinions. Respecting the great principles of religion, it is assumed that Christ had no means of knowledge which we do not possess. In short, these views are essentially the same with those which have been put forth again and again by successive Deistical writers, and which, after attracting attention for a time, have at length sunk out of notice. They are the same in substance with those of Voltaire, Rousseau, and the English Deists. The best known writer of this class which English literature has produced is Thomas Paine. He was a coarse and vulgar, but a vigorous and powerful man; and since Rousseau and Voltaire, beyond comparison the ablest writer among the popular assailants of Christianity. There is nothing of any moment in Newman, or Gregg, or Parker, which is not found stated with more vigor and brevity in Paine. They are men of more taste and culture, and are more practised rhetoricians. They may differ from him in certain philosophical sentimentalisms, and differ from him still more in a strange affectation of respect for a religion, to undermine whose authority they are devoting their most serious labors. But come to the great principles which they all hold, they equally reject the authority of Christ; they consider the idea of a miracle absurd; they all teach that the only sources from which religious truth is to be derived are nature and the human soul; and they all place much the same estimate on the worth of the Christian system and on the character of Christ. To show how little modification, even, the common notions of infidelity have received at their hands, we quote from the *Age of Reason* the declarations of Paine respecting these same points:—

“I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life. I believe the equality of man; and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow-creatures happy.

" . . . . . Nothing that is here said can apply, even with the most distant disrespect, to the *real* character of Jesus Christ. He was a virtuous and an amiable man. The morality that he preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind.

" The only religion that has not been invented, and that has in it every evidence of divine originality, is pure and simple Deism. Deism teaches us, without the possibility of being deceived, all that is necessary or proper to be known. The Creation is the Bible of the Deist. There is no occasion for such a thing as revealed religion.

" In every point of view in which those things called miracles can be placed and considered, the reality of them is improbable, and their existence unnecessary. . . . .

" Though I thus admit the possibility of Revelation, I totally disbelieve that the Almighty ever did communicate any thing to man otherwise than by the universal display of himself in the works of the creation, and by that repugnance we feel in ourselves to bad actions, and disposition to do good ones."

We deeply regret that the views set forth in the discourses at the head of this notice should have any currency among us. But being entertained, we are glad that they should be published and be known for what they are. We have been in the habit of hearing much of German theology. The most remarkable characteristic of the Rationalistic class of German theologians has not, in this country, been appreciated. These men have for the most part belonged to the Lutheran Church, and have received their support as persons dedicated to the teaching of Christianity, according to the views set forth in the orthodox formularies of Germany. Not a few of these men have spent their lives in writing out systems of theology, based upon creeds which they did not believe; in interpreting the Scriptures, whose authority they neglected; and in preaching Christ, while they regarded the Gospels as mere myths or fables. There never was a more dishonest or unmanly position. It required all the haziness of the German mind, and the debasing influence of German institutions, to reconcile them to a position which deserved the scorn and contempt of mankind. These have been the men who have been held up so much as among the gods of modern theology.

It seemed for a time that we were to have this infidelity under false pretences introduced into England and this country. There appeared to be a tendency among several popular authors who rejected the Christian religion, in the very act of rejecting it, to practise the affectation of being its special protectors and defenders. They merely wished to strip off the mummy-cloths in which it had been swathed and buried, — to free it from the encumbrances of folly and fraud which had collected around it, — and thus give its light an opportunity to shine forth to the world. By using words in double senses, by skilful rhetoric and



false issues, they confused and bewildered their own minds, and thus, unhappily both for themselves and the public, did much to prevent the true question in debate from being distinctly seen. Whoever spoke of them as rejecting Christianity, was regarded as a narrow-minded bigot and persecutor. We are glad this system of procedure is apparently at an end.

We do not mean to suggest that the opinions held by such persons were not honestly entertained. We measure no man's moral integrity by the character of his intellectual conclusions. The most erroneous opinions may be held as honestly as those which are most sound and true. Nay, more. We do not mean that the false position in which such persons stood was occupied with any conscious disingenuousness of purpose. They had come to it gradually. They were probably drawn into it in part by a disposition to imitate those German theologians whose learning was justly admired, but whose moral position was imperfectly appreciated. Then, regarding their views as true, it was easy for them to persuade themselves that they might legitimately use the places which they occupied for disseminating them, although the places had been given to them for the inculcation of quite opposite doctrines. But all this did not prevent their position being a false one. They were in the wrong, however, not in thinking for themselves, nor in proclaiming their opinions, but in the fact that their position as Christian ministers was understood by the public to be a perpetual profession of faith in a religion, whose authority they really denied.

While preparing this notice, we have met with some remarks of Rev. J. J. Taylor, — one of the most respected and best known among the English Unitarians, — in an ordination sermon recently delivered by him. By those acquainted with his writings, he will be suspected of any thing rather than bigotry or intolerance. We quote his words, because they show how this matter is viewed by one who has had special opportunities for forming correct conclusions respecting it, and whose mind and character give weight to his opinions.

“There are certain obvious limitations to the latitude of our opinions and to the indulgence of our spiritual sympathies, which reason and consistency in our actual position require us to observe. Churches calling themselves Christian should clearly rest on a Christian basis, — should be Christian in their belief, their spirit, and their practice. To take a name which does not represent our convictions, to profess Christianity and yet hold opinions which deny its claim to any peculiar authority over our hearts and lives, — is a course so disingenuous and hypocritical, that, if we can suppose any societies weak and wicked enough to adopt it, we may confidently predict their speedy dissolution, whatever ability they have engaged in their service, from the want of moral principle which makes them rotten at the core.”

The disingenousness consists in a profession of Christianity while holding opinions which deny its claim to any peculiar authority. He does not doubt that such opinions may be honestly held. He would lay no restriction on the free utterance of them under proper circumstances, but he would have those who entertain them bring them forward under their true names.

"Let those," he says, "who cannot see and do not feel the great truth there is in Christianity, or who believe that other modes of culture are better adapted to the present condition of the human mind, have full and free allowance for the expression of their own views, and organize, if they choose, their own associations for the promotion of them, within the needful limits of respect for the laws of society and the requirements of immutable morality. Deeply as we think them in error, we wish them well. They are our brethren by the indestructible affinities of God's spiritual universe; and we desire they should enjoy undisturbed the mental liberty which we claim for ourselves. If they will only be consistently honest, and work out their principles on every side to their legitimate results, we have no doubt that they, like all true and genuine natures, will ultimately serve the cause of truth. We have faith in truth; and to the God of truth we leave, without fear, the great issue."

For ourselves we have long considered the only serious question of theology now presented for debate, to be the question, whether we have or have not in Christianity a religion possessing a divine authority. Have we a religion revealed from Heaven, to which man must look up as an authoritative guide, or have we no religious truth except what we may derive from nature and the human mind? The questions between different sects are but questions respecting the interpretation of the record. All these various sects unite in believing that they have a religion to interpret, and one whose voice is of authority. They stand on one side of a gulf, on the other side of which stand those, of whatever name, who reject Christianity as possessing any peculiar authority.

But though this is the great question, it is not because scepticism has in it any thing of novelty. From the nature of the case, we could not expect it. In rejecting Christianity, mankind is simply remanded back, so far as the means of discovering religious truth are concerned, to the position occupied before the coming of Christ, and which is now occupied in every country to which his teachings have not come. The difference in religious faith between Christendom and those parts of the world outside the pale of Christendom, has been occasioned solely by the belief that Christ was invested with a divine authority as a teacher of religion. Rationalism does not pretend to open any new source of truth. In rejecting Christianity, it simply falls back on such light as nature affords to all men. When scepticism under-

takes to put forth a positive system, it may assume every form from Atheism to Rationalism, every form of philosophical opinion or heathen superstition, but in its denials of Christianity it is always substantially the same.

The only novelty in these views, as they have appeared among us, consists in the circumstance, that in this land of the Pilgrims they should ever have been proclaimed by Christian ministers, from the Christian pulpit, and under the shadow of Christian institutions. Every man who rejects the divine authority of Christianity knows very well that he would never have been sought to occupy a Christian pulpit, if his views had been distinctly stated. A Protestant church would not choose a Catholic priest for their minister, and still less would they choose one who rejected the authority of the religion which they wished to have taught to their children. A Christian congregation would no more select such a man for a Christian minister, than a mariner, on approaching the coast, would take a wrecker for a pilot. In finding such views presented in sermons, there is something novel; but it is a matter which will rectify itself when it is understood.

At a time when there are individuals who are devoting themselves to the work of destroying faith in the Christian religion as possessing any peculiar authority, it is important that reflecting persons should know on which side they stand. It is not because we have any fears about the fate of the Christian religion. Christianity is dependent on none of us for existence. It has lived and spread for eighteen centuries, and is more vigorous now than ever before. It is not Christianity which needs us, but we who need Christianity. But while scepticism assails the Christian faith in vain, it may in any given community do infinite mischief to the individuals who adopt it, and find in its uncertainties license and swing for self-indulgence. Even in this case we would lay no hindrance on the fullest and freest expression of opinion. Let every man think and speak for himself. We assume no other man's responsibilities. But we think it a matter of great moment, if there be those who teach infidelity, that it should be known to be what it is. It is a matter of simply common honesty not to introduce it under the cover of those sacred names which constitute a part of the universally recognized language of faith. Especially, if in the Christian ministry there are those so unfortunate as to be led in their speculations to disbelieve the authority of that religion which they were ordained to teach, it becomes them to let it be known. We do not mean that one should think it necessary to make proclamation of every uninvestigated difficulty or uncertainty. Let one whose mind is disturbed by sceptical questions pause



and consider and weigh and meditate long. Let him come to no hasty conclusions. Let a conclusion, which must be probably for life, be most serious and deliberate. In most cases, such deliberate examination, we believe, leads to faith. But when it leads to settled doubt, and when one has come to a fixed conviction, we think that, if he be a public teacher of religion, they who are under his influence should know it from himself, in the most explicit terms. This is what honesty and good faith require, and it is a course which deserves the respect which we give to honesty and good faith. We respect the man who takes the course of uprightness. We sympathize with him in the struggles, anxieties, and sacrifices which it may involve. We deeply regret that any one should lose his faith, and, above all, that one who has been a teacher of Christianity should array himself against its authority. But we see no other course for such a one than to have it plainly understood on which side he stands. It is for this reason that we think it a matter of importance that these sermons should have been published. We utter no words of fault-finding in regard to their authors, but, on the contrary, commend their frankness. We do not criticize the merits of their opinions, though we certainly regret that the ability, which we heartily concede to them, is not employed on another side. But there can be no question, that, holding such views, they were bound to state them in some unmistakable form, while the community, so far as it is under their influence, is profoundly interested in knowing their actual position.

This subject, however, is important not to theologians alone, but equally so to every member of the community. One's views in regard to the authority of Christianity must affect deeply his own notions of duty, and the strength of motive by which the practice of duty is enforced. It must affect his views of Providence, of man, and of society. Above all, its influence will be seen and felt in the education of children. If it were one of those subjects which could remain a mere matter of speculation, it might be of little consequence what one believed, or whether he had any definite belief at all. But no subject is so entirely practical. It has relations to every duty of life, and must go far towards determining all our expectations of the future. The mother cannot sit down to teach her child, but she must practically take one side or the other. If, when she reads the New Testament, the child asks what authority Christ had for declaring this, or commanding that, she is obliged to say, either that he had no authority, or that he spake with authority from God. She is obliged to proceed on the assumption, that we have nothing to guide us superior to our own feelings and reasonings, or that in Christ we have one who was sent to be our guide in this mortal pilgrimage. There is no middle ground.

If a man believes that the claim of Christianity to a supernatural origin is founded in folly or fraud, and that the results of this belief are pernicious to society, then he must look on those who are laboring to undermine faith in its authority, as the reformers and benefactors of Christendom. On the contrary, if he thinks that we owe to Christianity our best ideas of God, our best notions of duty, and the holiest motives for its performance, he cannot fail to regard their labors in a very different light. We would not have any one pretend to believe what he does not; far from it; first of all a man must be faithful to his own convictions. But on a subject of such moment, one ought to have settled convictions. When such a question is in debate, a thinking man, who wishes well to society, ought to know on which side he stands. Let him take the ground which seems right to him, but let there be no doubt on which side he takes his stand. Do you think it would be profitable to the poor, the lonely, the sick, and the afflicted, to lose their faith in a religion which is almost the sole source of comfort and support to them in their troubles? Do you think it would be well for the rich and prosperous and powerful to lose faith in that religion which rebukes their worldliness and selfishness, and which warns them in their luxuries, and in their pride of place or power, that, if they have no fear of man, they have still to answer for their misdoings before the righteous tribunal of heaven? Do you think that the young men who are sent from so many homes in the country into the new and multiplied temptations of city life, are likely to be gainers in neglecting the religion which they had been taught from parental lips, and in coming to the belief, that, though Christ may have been a wise and good man, he knew no more about God and duty and eternity than any one of us may know? Were you to discover that a teacher, to whom you had sent your son or your daughter, was inculcating these lessons of scepticism, teaching them to look with contempt on the idea that Christianity possesses any peculiar authority, would you think it an influence under which it would be advisable for your child to remain? The point that we urge is this, that on a subject of such moment, which at once blends itself with the great practical interests of life, a man ought to know on which side he stands. And if he believes that Christ possessed that authority which the Gospels ascribe to him for his own sake, his children's sake, and for the sake of the community, he is bound to do what he can to strengthen the institutions of Christianity, and through his words, and, above all, through the fidelity of a Christian character, to diffuse among others the good influences of a religion whose authority he reveres.

*The Friends of Christ in the New Testament. Thirteen Discourses* by NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D., Pastor of the Essex Street Church, Boston. Second Edition. Boston: T. R. Marvin and S. K. Whipple & Co. 1853. 8vo. pp. 295.

THE author of this beautiful volume was certainly favored beyond most divines who have published selections from their sermons, in the happy suggestion to his mind of so sweet and appropriate a title. So far as we know, the title, "The Friends of Christ," is original, in this use of it. It instantly commends itself as wholly free from affectation, and as giving promise to the heart that something in accordance with so tender a title would be made to present itself in the New Testament, with a significance before unperceived. Nor is that promise disappointed by the volume. From some positive statements, and from many implications of doctrine and sentiment, we withhold our assent, and our sympathy refuses to attach to them. But while our pleasure in perusing the volume is on this score qualified, we feel that we have received from it edification and instruction of the most precious kind. Over not a few passages the glow of the deepest Christian feeling is felt to be quickened, and, terms of speech which we should not ourselves have used being translated by us into more congenial phraseology, we yield to the conviction that we are communing with one who has a rich and tender Christian experience, one who has entered into the depths of his fond theme.

The sacred charm which the volume carries with it, by its title, is in suggesting to the mind that Christ, while on the earth, had friends, — that he was not friendless. A sympathizing spirit, guided by a delicate skill in discerning motives and a kindly interpretation of some seeming trifles as tokens of a deep sentiment, will find throughout the Gospels many intimations which admit of being turned to the profitable use for which Dr. Adams has employed them. The very enumeration of the themes by which he illustrates his general subject will open to the heart of every devout reader, who is familiar with the Gospels, a train of reflections in unison with the title, "The Friends of Christ."

The author says: "The object of these discourses is, to present the Saviour as an object of faith, and love, and worship; to excite those feelings which sinners should have to their Saviour, and if any are ashamed of Christ, to show them in what ways some of our fellow-men, from every rank and in every condition, have expressed their love and worship; and to make it appear that all things are but loss, compared with the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." (p. 24). And again, in another sermon, he says: "The object of these discourses, as al-



ready stated, is to illustrate the faith and love of which Christ has been the object, and thereby to encourage and quicken our faith and love, and, if need be, to remove the coldness of our affections." (p. 42.) We should, on the whole, prefer the second statement of his object to the former one, though we have nothing to criticize as objectionable in the former except the use of that word *worship*. Christ is nowhere presented in the Gospels as an object of worship. Even in these discourses we find but one suggestion which distinctly proposes any argument for the payment of divine honor to Christ, founded on the use of the word "worship." In the discourse on "The Wise Men from the East," Dr. Adams advances an argument of this kind. But to say nothing of the monstrous improbability of the supposition, that the wise men could have imagined that they were offering homage to the Almighty in a human form, the use of the word "worship" in the New Testament will not admit of its being applied always to religious homage. In the parable of the hard creditor, the debtor "fell down and worshipped" his lord. The discourses are indeed pervaded by the evidence of an intense and an all-absorbing conviction in the mind of their author that Christ is God. The whole Christian culture, the entire system of doctrinal opinions, the very life and substance of the faith of Dr. Adams, seem to be identified with this conviction. In support of it he will incorporate into every page of his discourses sentences, parts of sentences, and phrases taken at random from the Old Testament, and apply them as prophecies to Christ, in a way which to our minds is incompatible with any just and intelligent principles of interpretation. We cannot but express, over and over again, our amazement, that any Christian scholars should insist upon representing as the foremost and vital doctrine of the Christian faith, the dogma that Christ is God, which is not plainly and distinctly asserted in one single text; which must be sustained only by inferential deductions from obscure phrases that admit of easier interpretations; which introduces the darkest confusion into the whole theory of the Gospel scheme; and which is utterly inconsistent with hundreds of the most explicit and literal statements of the Scriptures. It would seem, for instance, as if the following passage from St. Paul, so plain, distinct, and positive in its assertion, would confound those who assert that Christ is the Supreme God: "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father. . . . For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. xv.

24-28.) In the name of all that is honest and serious in the speech and in the heart of man, we ask, what do these words mean? And we must answer, that Christ and God are two distinct beings, or else the Apostle has labored to mislead us.

Our author says: "Christ is a touchstone to every one of us. What think ye of Christ? is a question whose answer decides the truth or error of our belief. If he be to you only a creature, however exalted, superangelic, but still a creature, your views of the character of God, and of your own character, and of the way to be saved, and of future retribution, must be wrong. If Christ is God, and you worship him, and he made atonement for your sins, this affects the whole character of your belief." (p. 53.) It will be observed that this passage involves that daring venture of Calvinism, — than which we know of nothing more rash in the wildest speculations of Rationalism, — by which it presumes to dictate to God, that by no agency which he can devise shall he have the liberty of redeeming and blessing the human race, short of coming into the world and dying for it. How does Dr. Adams know that God could not make the mission of a superangelic being effectual for the salvation of the world? We know that Calvinists make and reiterate this assertion as if it were an axiom of the universe, or at least as if they had had a special revelation to assure them of it. But we do not hesitate to say, that there is real impiety in presuming thus to dictate to God on what terms or by what agency he shall reconcile men to him. The above assertion by Dr. Adams may not seem to him to involve presumption, but to us it appears to border on impiety. By what right does he thus dictate terms to God?

But there is another question which we would put to our author. Does he suppose, can he suppose for one moment, that either of those men or women whose faith and love he delineates as offering various tributes to the Saviour, imagined that he was the Supreme God? Did Simeon suppose that the child whom he took in his arms was God? Did the woman with the alabaster box suppose that she was anointing God? Did the penitent thief look at the sufferer by his side as God? Did Joseph of Arimathea regard the corpse which he committed to the sepulchre as the corpse of God? And when Jesus, having risen from that sepulchre, said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God," — could Mary have possibly entertained any other idea than that Christ and God were two distinct persons? Does it not introduce the darkest and the most bewildering confusion into all our attempts to form some clear idea of the Gospel scheme, if we thus admit that those who were entertaining the Saviour, and loving him, and listening to him, were actually in personal intercourse with the

God of their fathers embodied in a human form? We are aware that Dr. Adams is one of the most earnest and consistent opponents of Unitarian views, regarding them as fatal to the souls of those who hold them. But we think he must in candor allow that those views are not entirely destitute of Scripture warrant.

Most of the subjects of the thirteen discourses contained in the volume before us, are very beautifully presented together in the following paragraph from the last in the course.

"The wise men have travelled in our sight from the distant East, to worship Christ. Aged Simeon has held him forth to us in his arms. John the Baptist, than whom there is no greater among men, has rejoiced to perceive the light of his glory become pale before his Emmanuel and ours. The wedded pair at Cana have spoken to the young, that they remember Christ in the season of their espousals. The twelve Apostles of the Lamb present their names to us in the foundations of the New Jerusalem, as witnesses for Jesus. The children in the temple have called upon children everywhere to sing hosannas to the Son of David. Martha has turned at his rebuke, from being careful and troubled about many things, and has joined her sister at Jesus's feet, in choosing the good part which shall never be taken away from her. Simon the Cyrenian, that African, staggering under the ignominious cross which he bore for his Saviour, has said to you, 'Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.' The penitent thief has reproved the unbelief of every, even the greatest sinner, and has gone with Christ from the cross to a more than earthly paradise. Joseph of Arimathea, once a secret disciple of Christ, and Nicodemus, who also came to Jesus by night, have instructed those who are intellectual and cautious, how to be bold, and to confess Christ before men. Once more, that love to Christ which is stronger than death, is represented to us in those women sitting over against his sepulchre, and manifesting an ardor of love which many waters could not quench, nor floods drown." — pp. 293, 294.

From this summary are omitted the discourse on "The Woman with the Alabaster Box," which we regard as the richest in the volume, and that on "The Relenting Crucifier."

All that is touching and impressive and true in the tracings of a personal interest in Christ through these themes, owes its power to that Scripture view of him which regards him as one "whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world." But on the author's metaphysical view of Christ, the scenes and characters and incidents which he delineates would be inexplicable.

We cannot forbear a few words of comment on some passages in this volume which have fixed our attention in a careful perusal of it. In reference to the choice of the twelve Apostles by the Saviour, Dr. Adams says: "The great importance of this selection, perhaps, kept the Saviour awake all night, and, in communion with God, he sought and obtained direction. Here is an instance in which his human nature is seen to retain all its dependence, its need of prayer and of Divine guidance; the pres-



ence in his person of the Divine Word never confounding the distinction between the human and the Divine, but leaving him still the man Christ Jesus." (p. 107.) Can the author possibly connect any clear idea with his own assertion? Why not accept the plain inference from the fact, viz. that the Christ who was praying is the Mediator, sent into the world by God, and that the Being to whom he prayed was, not another part of his own individuality, but the God, the one Supreme God, to whom he taught us to pray?

Concerning Herodias Dr. Adams says: "No doubt she was a most accomplished person, danced well, and moved in the best society, so called; for she lived at court. But the noise of the viol and the tabret has long ago ceased with her, and perhaps, a frantic spirit in hell, she spends eternity with that charger before her eyes always, and that head, the price of her dance, haunting her from one deep to another deep in the bottomless pit. O mother, mother! she cries, you taught me every worldly accomplishment, and also, by your example, to forget God, and brought innocent blood on my soul." (p. 75.) Certainly this is a fearful doom to visit upon a young and thoughtless girl, who, in obedience to a mother's command, hastened the execution of a prisoner, of whose sacred character she appears to have had no knowledge. The mother would have been the more proper object of a proper punishment. But Dr. Adams might have yielded to the kindly suggestion, that, for any thing we know to the contrary, Herodias, having lived to repent and to become a good Christian, may now be rejoicing in heavenly bliss.

Dr. Adams says: "It is probable that Christ has saved the souls of more young children than of grown persons." (p. 142.) "As there are very many children in heaven, so there is reason to believe there are many young persons in hell. Those forty and two children who mocked Elisha, it is to be feared, are there, and others like them have perished in their sins." (p. 149.) We venture respectfully to suggest that Dr. Adams has no positive knowledge on these matters, and if he has not, would it not be better to abstain from such positive expressions concerning them? We have an opinion, too, on this point, founded upon the whole tenor and spirit of the Gospel, and it would lead us to believe, that God saves *all* children, and that Christ is the medium of salvation to some grown persons; all other grown persons, those who never heard of Christ included, being left to the just dealing of God. But such assertions as those of Dr. Adams we regard as eminently objectionable, as they drive many persons by disgust into that bold denial of all retribution after death, which deprives religion of all power over a hardened sinner.

Our author, very justly, as we think, vindicates the character of

Mary Magdalene from the popular opprobrium that has been connected with her name, as having been a woman of loose character; but, if we may be allowed to make such a use of a homely proverb, he seems to take her out of the frying-pan only to throw her into the fire: for he suggests that "Mary's good standing and influence in society would perhaps have been as likely as any thing to attract the notice and excite the malignity of the Devil and his angels." (p. 276.)

We have noticed many admirable sentences in this volume, expressing some noble truths in chaste and eloquent language, and we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting some of them. "Heaven and hope do more in preaching than hell and despair. Our object must be to persuade men when we use the terrors of the Lord; the law, with its requirements and penalty, must point to Christ; otherwise we awaken only wrath, or sullen recklessness, or despair. Our ministry, with all its alarms and threatenings, must be a ministry of reconciliation, and the definition of our great object must be this: 'But we preach Christ crucified.'" (p. 163.) Again, take the following beautiful sentences: "All who have had the care of children, or have been called to use moral influences with their fellow-men, know that law and its sanctions are instruments inferior to love and mercy; that it is easier to melt than to break, to draw than to drive, and that persuasion triumphs where correction and admonition have utterly failed. God regards this principle in his creatures, a principle established by his own creative wisdom; and, accordingly, the Gospel, rather than the Law, is the perfection of his progressive administration in a world of sin and a world of hope." (p. 166.)

The following sentences are eminently evangelical: "Many are the instances in which conversion seems to be the immediate consequence of love and gratitude, and no anguish is felt, at the time, in view of sin. A need of Christ, as a Saviour, of course exists; but the overwhelming emotion is approbation of God's character and dealings, complacency in some particular attribute, gratitude to Christ for what he has done, an assurance of safety in looking at the cross of Christ, a conviction of the infinite willingness of God to save sinners. There is nothing more absurd than to suppose that there is one process through which every mind must go, in obtaining peace with God. Some have fallen asleep upon their pillows with strong crying and tears, and have waked from sleep in the morning, feeling that all creation was praising God, and with a heart to praise him too. Submission to God, in Christ, had taken place in that weeping, and, as a consequence, joy came in the morning with the return of consciousness, after the composure of sleep. We cannot say that

this, or that, or another order of thought and feeling is the way to find peace with God." (pp. 171, 172.)

There is a volume of philosophy of the truest and the loftiest character in the following sentences : —

"Religion is the highest joy, or the greatest affliction, according to the state of our feelings toward God and spiritual things." (p. 211.)

"In religion, the great difficulty with all who are not deficient in knowledge, and yet do not believe, is, they have no heart for it. That which we dislike, it is comparatively easy to disprove, or, at least, to heap up objections to it." (p. 221.)

The earnest and devoted zeal of the Christian minister to commend the character and offices of the Saviour to the love and faith of human hearts, is apparent in the whole volume. Few writers of the author's school in theology give proof of so intense a conviction of the Scriptural character of the tenets which it professes to hold, as he manifests, nor does he betray, as many of them do, any desire to soften their asperity.

---

*The Ministry of Taunton, with incidental Notices of other Professions.* By SAMUEL HOPKINS EMERY, Pastor of one of its Churches. *With an Introductory Notice, by* HON. FRANCIS BAYLIES. In two volumes. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 394, 360.

THE compiler of these quaint and peculiar volumes is evidently a man of true antiquarian taste and enthusiasm. From the most scanty historic materials he has produced two solid volumes, which do credit certainly to his industry and his patience. He has taken care that nothing shall be lost, has rejected no fragment as worthless, and has reaped the whole field, tares, wheat, and all. Every scrap of manuscript, every note, however trivial or illegible, written by the hand of an ancient minister, is to him very precious. And yet we are pleased to discover that the theological temper of the fathers whom he so much loves, is not marked in his own spirit or style. There is nothing sectarian in the author's text, and only here and there an expression from which we might infer his Calvinistic views. Occasional remarks, indeed, show a want of acquaintance with the best modern systems of Biblical criticism, as where he speaks of "the impressive symbols and delightful imagery of the inimitable book" of Canticles, and "the idea of the Holy Ghost" therein. But in the main, he has left the "fathers" to speak for themselves, and has indorsed neither their scholarship nor their sentiments. He has given their sermons and letters



from the text of the originals, retaining the ancient orthography, capitals, italics, and punctuation, making them thus less attractive to the reader, but more curious as specimens of a nearly extinct species of discourse.

The basis of the work is an ecclesiastical history of all the territory originally included in the precincts of Taunton, embracing what are now the seven towns of Taunton, Norton, Dighton, Easton, Raynham, Berkley, and Mansfield, — a comprehensive plan certainly. But appended to each chapter, and incorporated also in the text, are masses of genealogical and statistical facts relating to the civil and social history of the villages. In the principal town, Taunton, no records of value prior to 1780 remain to give any aid in the narrative. Only such facts as could be picked up from letters, and allusions in printed volumes, and files of old papers, and gravestones, were available for the sketches of the early ministers of the town. These sources were diligently investigated, and enough was found about each of the eleven worthies who occupied the Taunton pulpit from 1638 to 1821, including pedigrees and names of posterity, to make for each a goodly chapter, with copious notes. The help of tradition, a most uncertain guide, is occasionally invoked, and in the absence of all account of the services at the ordination of Rev. Samuel Danforth, in 1687, a hypothetical programme is furnished, in which the several parts are assigned to brethren who *may* have given them. It is naively remarked, that "if the father of the candidate, the minister of Roxbury, *had been living*, we could easily decide who preached the sermon." To Cotton Mather, however, is assigned a part which that obstinate stickler for Congregational usage would hardly have performed. The "Address to the Society" is a quite recent innovation upon the old Puritan custom of ordinations; so that Cotton Mather, *though living*, could not have performed that part.

Troubled in the beginning by lack of material, the compiler seems to have suffered in the end from the embarrassment of his riches. To many of the chapters most redundant notes are added, containing all sorts of information about all sorts of persons and things, — epitaphs, poems, family tables, anecdotes, etc. These undoubtedly will add to the interest of the work for those who live in the old town of Taunton. But they mar its symmetry as an ecclesiastical history, and seriously break the upity of its purpose. We cannot think, either, that it was desirable to append to the ministry of an old divine, deceased a century and a quarter ago, notices of the legal and medical professions, which come principally within the last fifty years. The arrangement of the history gives to it a confused and heterogeneous look, which does injustice to its real order and progress.

Judging from the specimens of sermons, the Taunton pulpit must have had in its earlier days a fair share of ability. The sermons of William Hooke, the first minister, justify his reputation as a fine scholar and a sturdy Puritan. They are vigorous, bold, and full of true religious fervor. The Election Sermon of Mr. Danforth proves that he had not forgotten the prerogative of the ministry in addressing the civil rulers. Mr. Clap's Discourse in its accuracy of division, and its numerous heads, is characteristic of the preaching of his time, and makes up in length what it wants of force and point. The long letter of Mr. Crocker about "the work of grace," of which in his youth he was the instrument, compared with the long vindication of himself which, a few years later, he found it necessary to make, gives an instructive commentary on the disastrous tendency of revival follies and vagaries, and the failure of Calvinism to produce the fruits of a genuine and healthy religious peace. The few striking extracts given from Mr. Barnum's sermons make us regret that more of his plain, earnest, and terribly practical addresses had not been substituted for the tedious eccentricity of his successor, Rev. Ephraim Judson. We are left to judge of this hard old divine and the strange being who succeeded him, Rev. John Foster, principally by a collection of not very dignified anecdotes.

We observe that Mr. Emery skilfully avoids committing himself on that vexed question of church right, where sectarian bigotry is so apt to take issue with common sense and the law. He uses merely the mild term of *division* to characterize those secessions by which a few communicants in several of the towns separated themselves from a majority of the society. The schism of the church in Taunton seems to have been one of those cases where extreme orthodoxy not only rigidly excluded the more intelligent and liberal part of the congregation, leaving the church to dwindle because none could or would join it, but claimed also the right to dictate to the people concerning the ordinances of religion and the settlement of the minister. The controversy in Easton is quite recent, and Rev. Dr. Sheldon certainly dwells among "his own people." But we doubt the title which it pleases Mr. Emery to apply to the church and society which still continue to worship where the predecessors of Dr. Sheldon preached. The correct statement is that which is given of the division of the church in Mansfield.

Several sketches are furnished for the work by other hands. There is a most graceful and discriminating notice of Rev. Pitt Clarke of Norton, and an elaborate eulogy of Rev. Dr. Perez Fobes by the Rev. Messrs. Doggett, his son-in-law and grandson. Various lithographs, of the living and the dead, are in-

serted at intervals in the volumes, and fac-similes of many autographs are appended. A double index, of subjects and names, makes the work very convenient for reference. The old practice of publishing subscribers' names is here revived; with a doubtful taste, as we think, remembering what various motives lead men to put their names on subscription-papers which travelling agents press upon them. And the patronizing letters from distinguished men with which the work ends would have more value, if they had been written *after*, instead of *before*, its publication.

But with all the abatements to our praise in the taste and style of this history, we can commend it as the result of faithful, industrious, and earnest antiquarian zeal, and, on the whole, as a curious and interesting compilation. It undoubtedly rescues from destruction, materials which may hereafter be found very valuable.

---

*Hebrew Lyrical History; or Select Psalms, arranged in the Order of the Events to which they relate. With Introductions and Notes, by THOMAS BULFINCH. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1853. 16mo. pp. xx., 242.*

Nothing could be more modest than the pretensions made in behalf of this little book by its author, or, as he chooses to term himself, its compiler. It is evidently a labor of taste and love, and in no sense or degree of scholarly ambition. But for all this it is only the better and more welcome. This department of Biblical learning has not failed of thorough and sagacious translators and commentators; but their labors have often lacked adaptation to the general mind, while their results have been sometimes vitiated by preconceived theories or defective judgment. Mr. Bulfinch has, with a wise eclecticism, availed himself of the best renderings and the most satisfactory notes that he could bring together from a liberal range of English and American critics.

The interval between the reputed and not improbable date of the earliest and the latest composition in the Book of Psalms cannot be less than a thousand years, the *ninetieth* psalm having been always ascribed to Moses, while there are several which must have been written after the return from the Babylonish captivity. Many of them have reference to contemporary events, and all of them, like all true poetry, breathe something of the aroma of their own times and soil, — have something about them which made them appropriate then and there, rather than in any



other time, or anywhere else. It is self-evident, that an additional interest is imparted to them individually, if read in connection with the circumstances under which they were respectively written ; and to the whole collection, if read in the order of their composition, and as a poetical commentary on the fortunes of their authors and of the Hebrew nation. It is in this order that Mr. Bulfinch has arranged *one hundred and four* of the Psalms, and the only fault that we can find with the work is the omission of the remaining *forty-six*, the places of which in the series are indicated in a schedule following the table of contents. To most of the Psalms Mr. Bulfinch has prefixed brief and well-written introductions, describing the occasions on which they were indited, and often giving a concise summary of their contents. The text is broken into clauses representing the metrical divisions in the original Hebrew, and is followed in each instance by well-selected critical notes. The whole work is executed with the utmost literary care and precision, and with abundant marks of a spirit of profound reverence and exalted appreciation on the part of the compiler. We cordially recommend this book as a valuable aid in the study of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and as affording a commentary on the Psalms not without its worth to the critical student, but as especially deserving the gratitude of those whose Biblical researches must be prosecuted without the aid of the original tongues.

---

*A Pilgrimage to Palestine, with Notes and Observations on the Present Condition of the Holy Land, the Manners, Customs, and Institutions of the People, the Ruins of Ancient Cities, and the Prospects of Missionary Enterprises. With Numerous Engravings.* By J. V. C. SMITH, Editor of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, Author of "A Pilgrimage to Egypt," and "Turkey and the Turks." Boston : David Clapp, and Gould & Lincoln. 1853. 12mo. pp. 340.

WITH all Dr. Smith's liveliness of spirit, shrewdness of remark, and Yankee inquisitiveness, he has put forth a book which adds nothing to the labors of Robinson, Lynch, Kitto, Wainwright, &c., except a singular mass of errors and misstatements. With amazing confidence in his own glimpses at the country through a few weeks of entire dependence upon his dragoman's honesty, with no deference at all to the learned labors of those who have given the best part of their lives to the study of Palestine, he has united such haste in execution as has betrayed him into self-contradiction, inaccuracy, and untruth. Among the doubtful statements, we class the following : that the leprosy of

ancient times is "unknown at present in Palestine" (contradicted by Dr. S. himself upon the two hundred and eightieth page), — that the horns worn by married women are "frequently alluded to in the Psalms," — that the Druses are "an incomprehensible race, devoted to an entirely unknown religion," — that "the full measure of Divine wrath" has not yet fallen on Tyre, — that "no one in his senses believes" in the grave shown as that of Lazarus, — that there is an escape for the Dead Sea water "through channels yet undiscovered," — that the "last remains of Capernaum" were found by Dr. S., which Dr. Robinson failed to discover, — that there are "no more massive ruins" in Egypt than Baalbec, — that the Jordan has "few or no tributaries," — and that our Saviour visited the city of Tyre.

Among the statements which contradict well-known facts are such as these: that there are "but a few thousand Jews in Palestine," — that "only Mohammedans exist in Bethlehem," where the population is exclusively Christian, — that Damascus contains "only one great Khan," — that there are any thing "like five thousand people" at Baalbec, — that there are less than fifty Samaritans at present, — that Dr. S. "examined the greater part of the Jordan," — that the population of Nazareth is "only about a thousand," while Kitto gives three thousand, — and that the bathing-house built by Ibrahim Pacha at Tiberias had an "unknown origin"; see Robinson's *Researches*, Vol. III. p. 258.

It seems to us due to the credit of American letters, that, when a book of travels from the pen of an educated man is so prominently marked by errors of every kind, even against grammar and orthography, the periodical press should set its stamp upon the work. No doubt, with the study of other writers, a longer period in the country than a couple of months, an acquaintance with some other language than English, and greater care in preparation for the press, Dr. Smith's sagacity, intelligence, and good feeling would produce a readable book even upon this hackneyed theme.

---

*A Fortnight in Ireland.* By SIR FRANCIS B. HEAD. New York : G. P. Putnam & Co. 1853. pp. 216.

SIR FRANCIS has given us here a book equally interesting and valuable, — full of faithful details, interspersed with lively anecdote and spirited description. Besides the inexpressible relief of reading a book of travels where the author is going to stop as soon as his story is told, and where one is not deceived into reading a thrice-told tale, or a string of quotations from guide-books,

there is sufficient light of a most trustworthy sort upon some matters of practical moment.

Much has been said, on one side and the other, of the conversions from Romanism rewarding the energetic missionaries of the English Church in the West of Ireland. Sir Francis gives an explanation so simple that it can hardly fail to be true : the potato-rot first made the Catholic peasant of Ireland acquainted with the generous interest in his condition among the Protestant clergy ; it tore the bandage away from his purposely-blinded eyes ; it brought him into intimate friendship with a better kind of Churchmen ; it converted him, in fact, from an ignorant jealousy to a grateful trust. The Irish Catholics themselves ascribe the desertion of so many thousands to the failure of the national food, and the supplies still furnished in connection with the missionary schools ; and nickname the proselyting creed "the stir-about religion." Through the rural district near Galway, where his explorations were principally made, Sir Francis found a number of Protestant churches and school-houses newly erected, others enlarging, and others in preparation ; and, from all parties, ascertained that the Romish worship was far less frequented, in some of the former seats of Catholicity, than the services of the English Church. He honestly enough allows that the meal is a convincing argument in favor of the Protestantism, and very rationally relies upon the schools to carry the process still farther, and lay an immovable foundation for a better faith in the mind of the mass.

One part of the little volume is exceedingly sad, the description of roofless houses still inhabited in spite of rain and cold by "evicted" tenants. He shows that it was necessary some great change should be made ; that this process, when completed, gives a remainder of the people better support than before, saves the land-owner from ruin, recovers neglected tracts of country, and is a sure preventive of general suffering in future. But the poor Acadians' exile, which American genius has made so irresistibly touching, is no more melancholy than the work now carried on by the British police in Ireland, the destruction of villages and hamlets in order to clear the ground for the operations of large land-owners. And the most wonderful thing is, the continual testimony given by the "Constabulary" to the peaceful submission of the ejected tenantry. One head-constable, who had attended to all the evictions made by a London Life-Insurance Company over a tract of 170,000 acres, declared, that "the people committed no depredations during their distress" ; in another case the answer was, that "some went to the workhouse, some to England, some to America, and some to the grave" !



The uniform testimony of the police, and Sir Francis obtained it wherever he went, was, that great crimes were nearly unknown, even drunkenness being far more rare than in Scotland. The latter pages of the narrative are occupied in a vindication of the purity of Irish women, which leaves the reader with a delightful impression as he closes the pleasantest book of the "Traveller's Library."

---

*Essays on the Poets, and other English Writers.* By THOMAS DE QUINCEY, Author of "Confessions of an English Opium-Eater," etc., etc. Boston: Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1853. 16mo. pp. 296.

THIS is the tenth volume of the excellent edition of Mr. De Quincey's miscellanies, for which we are indebted to the judicious taste of Mr. Fields, the junior publisher. It comprises nine critical essays on modern English poets and prose-writers. Of these the largest and best is the very eloquent article on Pope, from the North British Review, which forms a necessary supplement to the brilliant essay on the same writer in a former volume of this collection. It is written in Mr. De Quincey's best manner, and is, we think, upon the whole, even superior to the previous essay, though it is disfigured by a similar unjust depreciation of Addison. Indeed, from some cause or another, our author always fails of rendering entire justice to that great writer, who did so much to elevate and purify English literature. Another noticeable paper in the volume before us is a review of Forster's Life of Goldsmith, also from the North British Review, in which Mr. De Quincey, with his usual tendency to forsake the main subject for the discussion of collateral issues, devotes most of his article to an examination of the relative position of men of letters in Goldsmith's age, in the age preceding it, and in our own time. Apart from this discursiveness the essay is a very able and striking production. A review of Walter Savage Landor's writings is also a very searching and characteristic essay, though it is not one of the best specimens of Mr. De Quincey's powers. The other essays are on the Poetry of Wordsworth, on Shelley, Keats, Godwin, John Foster, and Hazlitt. But they are mostly short, and do not demand a special notice. Taken as a whole, the volume is one of the most attractive and entertaining, but also one of the least able and scholarly, in the series. It has, indeed, much of the writer's wonderful brilliancy of style, breadth of learning, and keenness of analysis; but most of the papers are too brief to exhibit these powers in their highest perfection.

*Heaven and its Scriptural Emblems.* By RUFUS W. CLARK.  
Boston : John P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio : Jewett,  
Proctor, & Worthington. 1853. 8vo. pp. 269.

IN no respect has public taste made so sure and rapid progress as in the department of "annuals." We have longed to reclaim for the fire some of the choicest gifts of our younger days, — "*tokens*" less of friendship, than of the utter verdancy of Cisatlantic art and literature. We say "*and literature*"; for, "though there were giants in the land in those days," it was only giants' work that they knew how to do, and, when pressed into the magazine or *annual* service, they hardly rose above the *album* style and standard. The redeeming trait of those earlier gift-books was that the cover uniformly *came off* before the end of January, and they passed out of sight almost as soon as they were out of mind. But within the last half-dozen years the best endowments of the brightest minds have been largely employed in producing Christmas and New Year's offerings that may equally delight the eye and satisfy the intellect. And among annuals, we have been glad to recognize an increasing number of *perennials*, which have nothing within or about them to make them obsolete when their birth-year has expired. Such a book is the one before us. It possesses great artistical beauty, is faultless in typography and binding, and contains five engravings of superior merit, designed by Billings, and engraved by Wagstaff and Andrews. The text consists of a series of essays by Mr. Clark on the evidences of a future life, the recognition of friends in heaven, and the various images and symbols under which the blessedness of the redeemed is shadowed forth in the phraseology of the New Testament. These subjects are treated in a style redolent of the true poetry of devotion, and at the same time without mysticism, and without the intrusion of such ideas as are the property of single sects rather than of the Church collectively. The argumentative portions are admirably adapted to confirm the faith of the serious inquirer, and the chapter on the "*Recognition of Friends*," the longest in the book, is unsurpassed in the tender, delicate, sympathetic handling of a subject on which so many believing and devout minds are oppressed with painful misgivings. The entire book cannot fail to instruct and edify every religious reader. It is free from technicalities, bold and liberal in its tone of speculation, and pervaded by the spirit of confiding faith and fervent piety. We trust that it will guide and cheer the steps of many a pilgrim toward the blessed home from which it derives its name and theme.

*On the Lessons in Proverbs: being the Substance of Lectures delivered to Young Men's Societies at Portsmouth and elsewhere.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D., author of "The Study of Words," &c. New York: Redfield. 1853. 16mo. pp. 140.

THERE are two reasons why an author who undertakes to write upon the subject expressed in the above title should be expected to produce an interesting and instructive book. In the first place, he has very abundant and rich materials already furnished to his hand, in the collections and essays of those who have preceded him. And in the second place, the theme is an eminently suggestive one, quickening all the more vivid faculties of the mind, and presenting the wisdom of the sage or the peasant in the most striking forms of quaintness, terseness, wit, or common sense. Without having exhibited any very signal ability in treating his subject, either in research for materials, or philosophy in generalizing upon them, or acuteness in presenting the more delicate elements which enter into the finer proverbial sayings, Mr. Trench has still produced a very delightful volume. It contains five Lectures, with an Appendix devoted to "The Metrical Latin Proverbs of the Middle Ages." The Lectures bear respectively the following titles: The Form and Generation of Proverbs; The Proverbs of Different Nations compared; The Poetry, Wit, and Wisdom of Proverbs; The Morality of Proverbs; The Theology of Proverbs.

Something of the long-proved, experimental wisdom of proverbial sayings enters into the etymology of the very words which give them their common titles. Thus the word *Proverb* is *pro verbum*, or, instead of our own word, adopting or following the word of others, the saying or advice the authority of which is well established. The meaning of the word *Maxims*, as the *greatest* rules of wisdom, is well defined in the following line:

"Regulæ quæ inter *maximas* numerari merrentur."

*Adages*, as the etymology imports, are "things apt for action and use," — *Adagia ad agendum apta*. Our author observes the fact that proverbs are more frequently used by the common people, than by the fastidious and the cultivated. Lord Chesterfield said, "No man of fashion ever uses a proverb." The maxim which passes from mouth to mouth, and is accepted through successive generations as having the value of a truth, is distinguished from other sentences equally true which we may all utter, as a coin with the mint-stamp upon it is distinguished from a piece of gold or silver of the same size and intrinsic worth, but without the stamp. A proverb, or "a saying which combines the wit of one with the wisdom of many," has been said to require three ingre-



dients, — “shortness, sense, and salt.” Martial, in his epigram upon epigrams, most felicitously expresses his own idea, —

“Omne epigramma sit instar apis; sit aculeus illi,  
Sint sua mella, sit et corporis exigui.”

Aptly rendered by Mr. Trench, —

“Three things must epigrams, like bees, have all, —  
A sting, and honey, and a body small.”

Not wholly approving the alliterative terms given above to define the ingredients of a proverb, Mr. Trench does not venture to rival the definition with one of his own. In treating of the generation of proverbs he is inclined to allow a great age to many which might seem quite modern, and to ascribe a foreign origin even to some that appear to have a warrant of nativity in the place where they are most tersely used. Thus, the well-known saying, “*One must not look a gift-horse in the mouth,*” might be supposed to be distinctly of English origin; but it is used in precisely the same terms by Jerome, in the fourth century.

As to the *morality* of Proverbs, Mr. Trench meets fairly the undeniable truth, that they are not all on the side of generosity, virtue, magnanimity, or of any form of faith in our fellow-men. Some proverbs, especially those of Italy, are of a savage hate and ferocity. Thus, “*Revenge is a morsel for God*”; “*Revenge of a hundred years old hath still its sucking teeth.*” There are some “scoundrel maxims,” as an old English poet calls them; as for instance, “*Draw the snake from its hole by another man’s hand.*” This is a Spanish proverb, as is also that most atrocious and dastardly saying, “*One must howl with the wolves*”; i. e. one must, for his own safety, join in the general cry against a victim. The author justly affirms that proverbs of an immoral, cynical, or selfish significance are *comparatively* rare; in the minority with all people, and immeasurably in the minority with most people. An amazing and invaluable sum of well-attested truth, of a prudential, unselfish, and holy influence, goes down with good proverbs.

We are under obligations both to the author and the publisher of this volume for some delightful occupation for a winter evening, found in its contemplative study.

---

*Spain: her Institutions, Politics, and Public Men. A Sketch.*  
By S. T. WALLIS, Author of “*Glimpses of Spain.*” Boston:  
Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1853. 16mo. pp. 399.

THE approbation with which Mr. Wallis’s former work was received will insure a ready welcome for these fruits of his second

visit to Spain. He proves himself to have been a wise observer of what was before his eyes, and an acute discerner of facts and causes which underlie the social and political condition of Spain. His book is free from offensive personalities, from all abuses of private information, and from all uncharitable judgments upon institutions which differ from those under which he was himself educated. In chapters just long enough to instruct without wearying, and entering sufficiently into details to give us a living idea of men and measures, without burdening us with too many particulars, the author presents the public characters, the institutions, the social, political, literary, and religious condition of Spain, as they now actually exist. He is a very lively writer, and every page is quickened by some brilliant flash of wit or humor, and by some shrewd remark which proves that the author has a knowledge of human nature and a philosophy of his own. We read the pages with a confidence that the author is dealing fairly by us, and is aiming to impart valuable information in an intelligible and agreeable way.

---

*The Three Colonies of Australia: New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia; their Pastures, Copper Mines, and Gold Fields.* By SAMUEL SIDNEY, Author of "The Australian Hand-Book," &c. With numerous Engravings. London: Ingram, Cook, & Co. 1852. 8vo. pp. 427. [Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co.]

THIS valuable and authentic account of the new land of gold has not been reprinted in this country, a large number of copies of the London edition having been imported for sale here at a cheaper price than that at which it could be afforded if republished. An examination of the volume will justify the judgment passed upon it by the London journals, as containing by far the best account that we have of the natural features, the history, and the present social and economical condition of Australia. The sketches of the early voyages and discoveries, dating eighty-three years ago, the harrowing and irritating details connected with the use of the colony as a penal settlement and the speculations of unprincipled land-owners, and the narratives of the government and the misgovernment of the successive representatives of the British crown, occupy the first part of the volume; the second and third parts are devoted to matters of present interest to emigrants and business-men. The book has interest to a great variety of readers, and from many points of view. It appears to have been composed in a spirit of entire honesty and candor, and with the fullest means of information. The com-

mercial prospects of the region have drawn to it many of our young people, and their friends will find in this volume much which they will be glad to know.

---

*The Complete Works of SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE. With an Introductory Essay upon his Philosophical and Theological Opinions.* Edited by PROFESSOR SHEDD. In seven volumes. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1853. 12mo. pp. 485.

WE have here the first-fruits of an enterprise by which those indefatigable publishers, the Messrs. Harper, are putting our scholars and reading circles under new obligations to them. The various productions of Coleridge have been scattered into so many publications of different sizes and shapes, more or less complete, as parts of his mental labor, and so mixed up with the prefaces and essays and notes of different editors, that no one could range his works together on his shelves, or obtain them without purchasing considerable irrelevant matter with them. The elegant volume before us, which is to be followed by six more, to complete the work, is therefore a most welcome contribution to our libraries. It contains the *Aids to Reflection*, and the *Statesman's Manual*, with Dr. Marsh's Preliminary Essay to the former work, and an Introductory Essay by the present editor upon the speculative opinions of Coleridge. Though Professor Shedd shows himself to be a profound admirer of Coleridge, he expresses qualifying approbation, and some abating criticism, where the cloudy philosopher is most original in his flights. We shall need to recur to this theme, as the successive volumes give us an occasion to do so.

---

*Napoleon in Exile: or, A Voice from St. Helena. The Opinions and Reflections of Napoleon on the most important Events of his Life and Government, in his own Words.* By BARRY E. O'MEARA, Esq., his late Surgeon. In two volumes. New York: William Gowans. 1853. 16mo. pp. 512, 552.

The same Work. Redfield: New York. 1853. 16mo. pp. 328, 322.

THE simultaneous publication of two new American editions of Dr. O'Meara's garrulous journal at St. Helena, may be regarded as a token that our publishers know very well what sort of



books are sure of a good market. A new generation of readers has come up since these entertaining, gossipy volumes first appeared. The fidelity of the journalist is as unquestioned as his opportunities for making a good book upon his patient were favorable. The doings of the nephew of Napoleon have excited a fresh interest in the career and fate of the uncle. There must be many to whom O'Meara's journal will be wholly new, and we assure them that, even amid the multitude of books around them, they can hardly lay their hands upon one which will afford them more entertaining information. We need not draw any distinction of merit between the two impressions of the work now before us. Either one of them will serve the reader equally well. It is but fair, however, to say, that the edition of Mr. Gowans is in larger type.

---

*Pastoral Theology ; or the Theory of the Evangelical Ministry.*

By A. VINET. Translated and Edited by THOMAS H. SKINNER, D. D, Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. With Notes, and an additional Chapter, by the Translator. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1853. 12mo. pp. 387.

UNQUESTIONABLY every Christian minister and candidate for the ministry will find in this volume some suggestions which will heighten his sense of responsibility, and instruct him in the better fulfilment of his high duties. The theory of the ministry on which the writer proceeds approves itself in the main to us. Of course his Calvinistic views give a character to some of his thoughts and counsels which does not answer to the truth as it appears to us. But the earnestness, the intelligence, the unction, and the manifest engagedness of heart and soul which the writer exhibits, will feed with good nutriment the spirit of every well-disposed reader. The Chapter which the Translator has added relates to the care of souls in times of special declension and special interest in religion.

---

*English Items : or, Microscopic Views of England and Englishmen.* By MATT. F. WARD, Author of "Letters from Three Continents." New York : D Appleton & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 357.

It is but fair that our cousins across the water should occasionally receive a return in kind for those satirical and fault-finding criticisms which their travellers have so plentifully visited upon

us. If any of them should read this volume, they will find that there has recently been among them a sharp-eyed man who could detect some of their own weak points, and who knows, too, how to set them off with a sharp-pointed pen. No American can have looked much about him in England without observing many things which were fair subjects of satire, independently of that provocative which he may have felt to return like for like on the score of offensive revelations by writers of the Trollope and Fidler schools. We hope that Mr. Ward's good-humored sarcasms will be taken in good temper. The recent correspondence which has passed between "ladies" in England and the United States is commended to Mr. Trench, if he should have occasion to moralize upon the old proverb concerning "the pot calling the kettle black."

---

*A Digest of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations.* By THOMAS DEW, late President of the College of William and Mary. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1853. 8vo. pp. 662.

THIS volume appears to contain an extended syllabus of the heads of academic exercises in the recitation-room on the study of history. At any rate, its highest value would seem to lie in its adaptation to such a use. It embraces the results of a vast deal of reading, and brings together the principal characters and facts of ancient and modern history under a very clear method of arrangement. It could hardly serve for any thing more than an historic manual, as it necessarily offers such condensed statements that a reader's curiosity is constantly excited without being gratified. Still, for a single book, it contains so much, that it deserves to be commended to those who can purchase or read but few volumes.

---

*Outlines of Astronomy.* By SIR JOHN F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart., K. H. A New Edition. With Numerous Plates and Woodcuts. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea. 1852. 8vo. pp. 557.

THIS is an American reprint of a work whose merits we examined and pronounced upon at some length in a review of the London edition of it. We regard Professor Olmsted's *Letters on Astronomy* as the simplest and most intelligible book for popular use on the science upon which it treats. This work of Herschel's, however, is more full, and but little more abstruse. Indeed, we could scarcely expect that such a science could be

made any more popular or intelligible in its great principles and facts, than the science of the heavens is made in these volumes. If this book is read consecutively, with a fixed attention, and with an occasional withdrawal of the eye from the page, that the mind may digest its materials for thought, the reader, though unskilled in abstruse exercises, will learn from it a vast deal more than he might suppose. Herschel makes a free and a judicious use of illustrations in the statement of astronomical facts, and he thus affords an unscientific reader much help.

---

*The Lofty and the Lowly : or, Good in All and None all Good.*

By M. J. McINTOSH. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 299, 323.

THE story is interesting, and well told. The characters early take hold of the reader's sympathies, and keep hold of them to the end ; at least we have found it so. The moral and spiritual tone of the book is elevated and pure. The scene is laid, partly at the North and partly at the South, and the writer intends to do justice to what is good and happy in both localities. Slavery is, of course, touched upon, and is presented in its less painful and offensive phases. "Daddy Cato" is the type of the intelligent, faithful, affectionate, contented, and happy slave ; and as we suppose there are corresponding realities in slave-land, we can afford to have it presented without danger to our antislavery principles. We cannot expect to correct what is wrong in any social condition, until we have first exercised our intelligence and charity in doing justice to whatever there is of good in it.

---

*The Miscellanies of HENRY ROGERS, Author of "The Eclipse of Faith."* Boston : Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1853. 12mo.

THIS volume contains a selection of the more interesting and popular papers which are embraced in the two volumes of the London reprint of the author's contributions to the Edinburgh Review. They are some of the most instructive Essays of our day, and will meet, we believe, with a cordial reception.

---



## INTELLIGENCE.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

A MULTITUDE of new books claim our notice, though we can do little more than name them, with a word or two to indicate their interest for various classes of readers.

The Messrs. Harper have completed the reprint of Chambers's *Life and Works of Robert Burns*. This work, in four neat volumes, is one of the most complete and perfect publications to be found in the whole fruitful field of letters. We have already stated the plan of the work, as embracing the letters and poems of Burns, arranged chronologically, with such illustrative and explanatory matter from the editor as makes the life of the poet the thread of his literary history. There will be no occasion for any further editorial labor upon this subject. Mr. Chambers has exhausted it by his most indefatigable and judicious toil.

The same publishers continue Agnes Strickland's *Lives of the Queens of Scotland*, by the first volume of the *Life of Mary, Queen of Scots*. This new biography of a most romantic subject has been anxiously looked for by the admirers of the authoress, because of the promised introduction of new materials upon a dark theme. The volume makes a faithful use of these materials, and is an unqualified vindication of Mary from the severest charges which have been visited upon her.

M. Guizot's brilliant essay on Shakspeare and his times, from the press of the same publishers, contains an admirable *résumé* of criticisms and comments upon the world's great poet.

The same publishers have issued the third volume of Lamartine's *History of the Restoration of the Monarchy in France*; a work which is sure of popularity, though the faults of the author's genius must be set against its fascinations.

A handsome volume from the same firm bears the title of the "*American Missionary Memorial. Including Biographical and Historical Sketches. Edited by H. W. Pierson, A. M. With numerous Illustrations.*" As a condensed and comprehensive statement of the facts of American Missionary enterprise, and a grateful record of the most devoted laborers in that field, the volume is worthy of all praise. It will weary no reader. It cannot but engage the admiring regard of every Christian, and its beautiful illustrations will help the effect of its narratives.

The same publishers, consulting variety in their productions, have issued "*The History of an Adopted Child. By Geraldine Endor Jewsbury.*" Probably the sad and sober experiences which the book relates come much nearer to the truth of life than do most of the stories of young or old persons. The name of the authoress is a warrant for the good moral tendency of her works.

The Messrs. Appleton & Co., of New York, have issued four new works, which, though they must be classed under the title of novels, are of a higher order than are most of the works which come under that designation. They are "Lady Bird, a Tale," by Lady Georgiana Fullerton; — "The Dean's Daughter; or the Days we live in," by Mrs. Gore; — "The Experience of Life," by E. M. Jewett; — and "Light and Shade; or the Young Artist; a Tale," by Anna Harriet Drury.

Messrs. Ticknor, Reed, & Fields add to the treasures of our libraries several new and valuable works. Among them come three volumes of poetry. The Poems of Charles Mackay, and the Poems of Henry Alvord, are fruits of the living poetic spirit in England, while a smaller volume bears the title of "The Chapel of the Hermits, and other Poems, by John G. Whittier." There are some exquisite pieces in the volume by Alvord, which we prefer on the whole to that of Mackay, though grateful for both of them. Whittier is always welcome to us for the heartiness and earnestness of his strains. — We are anticipating the pleasure of perusing a new novel, just issued by this firm, under the simple title of "Ruth," of which it is enough to assure our expectations of delight and improvement from it, that it is written by the author of "Mary Barton."

The "Kathayan Slave, and other Papers connected with Missionary Life," by Emily Judson, is the title of another publication by the same firm, which we received too late for perusal or to permit us to pass our opinion upon it. The name of the authoress, however, will give it a sure passport, and class it among the books which need only to be announced to be sure of a wide circulation.

"The Sickness and Health of the People of Bleaburn," published by Crosby, Nichols, & Co., is a narrative which essentially records the devoted kindness of Mrs. Ware, on an occasion familiar to the readers of her recently published Memoir.

#### RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Installations.* — The Rev. GEORGE W. BRIGGS, late of Plymouth, was installed as Pastor of the First Church in SALEM, on January 6th. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. W. O. White of Keene, N. H.; Selections from the Scriptures, by the Rev. O. B. Frothingham of Salem; Sermon, by the Rev. J. H. Morison of Milton; Installing Prayer, by the Rev. Dr. Thompson of Salem; Fellowship of the Churches, by the Rev. Dr. Flint of Salem; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Dexter Clapp of Salem.

The Rev. CRAWFORD NIGHTINGALE, late of Chicopee, was installed as Pastor of the First Church in GROTON, on January 26th. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Mr. Chandler of Shirley; Selections from Scripture, by the Rev. Mr. Fosdick of Groton; Sermon, by the Rev. Dr. Hall of Providence, R. I.; Prayer of Installation, by the Rev. E. E. Hale of Worcester; Charge, by the Rev. Calvin Lincoln; Fellowship of the Churches, by the Rev. G. M. Bartol of Lancaster; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Mr. Babbidge of Pepperell.

*Ordinations.* — Mr. FRANCIS TIFFANY, a graduate of the Theological School at Cambridge, was ordained as Pastor of the Third Congregational Society in SPRINGFIELD, on December 30th, 1852. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. Charles Brooks; Selections from the Scriptures, by the Rev. S. S. Hunting of Brookfield; Sermon, by the Rev. Dr. Burnap of Baltimore, Md.; Ordaining Prayer, by the Rev. Calvin Lincoln of Boston; Charge, by the Rev. Prof. Francis of Cambridge; Fellowship of the Churches, by the Rev. Charles Lowe of New Bedford; Address to the Society, by the Rev. Dr. Gannett of Boston; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. Ephraim Nute of Chicopee.

Mr. RUSHTON D. BURR, from the Theological School at Cambridge, was ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Society at MEDFIELD, on January 12th. Introductory Prayer, by the Rev. F. Hinckley of Haverhill; Selections from the Scriptures, by the Rev. R. Sanger of Dover; Sermon, by the Rev. Calvin Lincoln of Boston; Ordaining Prayer, by the Rev. A. B. Muzzey of Cambridge; Charge, by the Rev. Dr. Allen of Northborough; Fellowship of the Churches, by the Rev. Robert Hassall of Mendon; Address to the Society, by the Rev. J. M. Merrick of Walpole; Concluding Prayer, by the Rev. C. C. Sewall of Medfield.

---

#### OBITUARIES.

REV. SYLVESTER JUDD died at Augusta, Me., on the 26th of January. He was born at Westhampton, July 23d, 1813, and spent in that town the first nine years of his life, after which his family removed to Northampton. Under the influences of the Calvinistic creed in which he was educated, his earnest and impulsive nature early received a strong religious bias. At the age of thirteen he partook in the influences of a deep religious excitement which prevailed at Northampton, and became the subject of impressions, which, through the great change which his opinions afterward underwent, determined the subsequent course of his spiritual life. At that early age, with a zeal which ever characterized him, he endeavored to win the attention of his playmates to religion, and by the fervor and unctions of his exhortations attracted the interest of persons of maturer age.

In his childhood he discovered an ardent thirst for knowledge, and was anxious to enjoy the benefits of a collegiate education, but the narrow circumstances of his family seemed to preclude the fulfilment of that desire. He was accordingly destined to a life of business, and accepted a clerkship in a store, first in Greenfield, and afterward in Hartford. But with increasing years his passion for learning grew, and his aversion to mercantile pursuits became more decided. At length the obstacles to the accomplishment of his favorite wish were removed, and he commenced his preparation for college in the summer of 1831, and entered at New Haven the following year. Here he cheerfully endured the privations and labors which his straitened circumstances made necessary, won an honorable reputation for scholarship and exemplary deportment, and graduated with high distinction in 1836.

During his college life he began to entertain doubts of the creed in which he had been educated, with which the tenderest associations of his affectionate heart and the religious experiences of his earnest spirit



were entwined. It was a long and painful conflict, some of the more prominent details of which are sketched in a tract, written by him whilst a member of the Cambridge Theological School, and published by the Unitarian Association under the title of "*A Young Man's Account of his Conversion from Calvinism. A Statement of Facts.*" This conflict resulted in a clear, settled, fervent Unitarian faith, which gave fresh vigor to his spiritual life, and inspired the zeal and activity of his ministry. Immediately after the completion of his theological education he preached a few Sundays in Deerfield and Augusta, and received invitations from the churches in both places. He accepted the latter, and was ordained October 1st, 1840.

Mr. Judd was a man of rare and peculiar excellence of mind and character. The raciness and discursive originality of his conversation, and his genial and hearty nature, awakened the interest and secured the attachment of those who held the shortest and most casual intercourse with him. So guileless was he, that to see was to know him, and so kind, that to know him was to love. In his speech and behavior there was the utmost simplicity and directness. The common forms of society were the least possible restraint upon him. It seldom seemed to occur to him that one time or place was more fit than another for saying any thing that he believed to be true, or doing any thing that he thought to be right. But if he were thus betrayed into occasional breaches of etiquette, they were readily pardoned for the sake of the genial love that manifestly shone through them. One little acquainted with him might sometimes think his peculiarities assumed for effect; but those who knew him best, best knew how unconscious he was, and how abhorrent to his whole nature was the least approach to affectation.

Earnestness was a prominent trait in his character. It was not an occasional effervescence of spirit, but the overflowing of a deep and full spirit. It was calm, equal, and constant, always ready for utterance and action. It proceeded from a deep insight into the solemn significance of life. He saw the defects of society as at present constituted, he longed for a greater infusion into it of a Christian spirit; he saw that a great work was waiting to be done by Christian hands, he fully felt his own responsibility concerning it, but that sense of responsibility did not oppress him. He accepted it cheerfully. He felt strong and hopeful to discharge his share of the trust. An expression of indignation at sin might occasionally be heard from him, but never a tone of fear or despondency. His was a perfectly healthy earnestness.

His love was widely comprehensive. His sympathies embraced all orders and conditions of men. He had a genuine respect for human nature in every form. He felt a sincere interest in the condition of the ignorant, the degraded, and the vicious. He loved to talk with them, and study their manners, and habits of thought and expression. His success in this study is shown in many of the descriptions contained in his works of fiction. Yet he did not possess in any high degree the tact necessary to make such intercourse complete. His humble brethren must often have misunderstood him, but they could not fail to understand that he had a large and glowing heart.

His faith, also, in human nature was strong; faith in its capability of restoration from the depths of degradation and sin; its native capability of receiving and responding to the influences of the Gospel, and of being raised by it to the sublimest heights of excellence. Of all the tenets of

the Calvinistic system, there was no one from which he so vehemently reacted, as that of total and innate depravity. In the most degraded man he saw "not less than archangel ruined," and one that stood all ready to reascend the heavenly spheres. Whilst he keenly discerned the wrongs and evils of society, and was painfully aware of the discrepancies between the moral condition of Christian communities and the standard of their professed religion, he was unwilling to acknowledge that fact as a proof of any natural proclivity in man to evil. He did not love to dwell on the contemplation of evil any longer than was necessary to consider its remedies. He turned instinctively from existing evil to possible good. In each of his three works, the contrast between actual corruption and an ideal Christian state of society is sharply drawn, and the picture of actual corruption by no means mitigated; yet amidst it all, he does not fail to exhibit the struggling elements of goodness, which give the promise and furnish the means of regeneration.

He was in one sense a practical man. He saw the direct bearing of all religious truth on life, and he asserted the duty of himself and all others to make the application as soon as possible. He would tolerate no dead matter in his creed. All the articles of his faith must be vital. He had no idea of any but a living and glowing faith. But the balance of his powers was not such as to qualify him eminently to be a practical reformer. The cast of his mind was poetical, bordering on the mystical. His idea of what was desirable was removed from the actual state of things by a greater distance than his executive power was able immediately to bridge over. Accordingly, he first sought to clothe his thought in fiction. He described what he would fain have performed. Thrice did he utter his solemn protest against prevailing evil, and invite men up to the beautiful heights of Christian excellence, by his contrasted pictures of real evil and ideal good. And not wholly in vain. His voice was heard, and will continue to be listened to, and will quicken and inspire the activity of more practical men than himself, and will do good through their agency.

His three works, "Margaret," "Philo," and "Richard Edney," can be fairly judged only when viewed as embodiments of his religious and philanthropic ideas. This was obviously the main purpose of their production, and gave them their form and pressure. To this end his minute and accurate descriptions of nature, and his varied delineations of human life and character, were incidental and subordinate. It was not his aim to produce works of high artistic finish. Had he cultivated his extraordinary graphic powers with this view, many of the faults and blemishes which his great admirers acknowledge in his writings might have been avoided; although severely discriminating taste was not mingled in the usual proportions with his creative genius. Yet these works abound with passages of faultless beauty. The demand for successive editions of them indicates the high estimation in which the public heart holds them. Amidst all the criticism they have elicited, they have won for themselves a permanent place in our national literature.

Probably, had he lived, he would have acted more directly on the condition of society. His natural tendency was in that direction. During the last year, he had been absorbed by an earnest wish to give new power and significance to the institution of the Church. He desired to awaken all to a sense of the relations in which all who are born in a

Christian land stand to the Gospel of Christ ; of the benefits which all, though unconsciously, are deriving from it ; and of the obligations of all within whose reach its means of grace are placed ; — obligations that cannot be escaped by any man's refusal to acknowledge them. He thought that men were designed to live in church estate as much as in the civil state and in the family ; and that they are born into the one as much as into the other. This idea, the original idea of the Church, as he considered it, but which has been in a great degree lost sight of in Protestant communities, and is very imperfectly represented in our present ecclesiastical institutions, he wished to see revived, brought distinctly to men's consciousness, and embodied in new church organizations. One of the last acts of his life was to take practical measures for actualizing this idea among the people of his charge.

On the first Sunday of the year he preached his last sermon, in which, after speaking of the deaths that had occurred among his flock, he alluded to the possibility of his own decease during the year. In the course of the following week he was suddenly smitten with severe disease, from which he had partially recovered, when a relapse rapidly terminated his days.

---

Died in Amherst, N. H., January 8th, HON. CHARLES H. ATHERTON, aged 79. Charles Humphrey Atherton was born in Amherst, N. H., August 14th, 1773. His father was the Hon. Joshua Atherton, a prominent lawyer at the New Hampshire bar, and a member of the Convention held in 1788 for ratifying the Constitution of the United States. The son was graduated at Harvard University in 1794, and, after the usual preliminary studies, he adopted the law as his profession, in which he achieved an honorable distinction. He was elected a member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of 1816-17, and at a subsequent period held office in the Legislature of his native State. Mr. Atherton remained in the discharge of his professional duties, and of various other trusts, until late in life ; nor was ever any one, perhaps, more prompt to do service, and more zealous for the public good, with less incitement from motives of personal ambition.

Mr. Atherton's mind was distinguished by clear and accurate perceptions, sound judgment, a will strong in purpose without impetuosity, and a persistent patience both in deliberation and inquiry. He began early, and never laid aside, the habit of a thorough industry. So uniform was this, and so deeply set, as to wear the grace of some beautiful instinct. There was in it no bustle, no hurry. It was the genuine love of labor stirring the whole being, and keeping its energies directed in constant application to wise and useful results. He seemed as one who could not rest idle, and yet his movements were so quiet that he imposed no disagreeable constraint on those near him, although his very presence was a reproof to a listless inaction. There were several very marked and sterling qualities exhibited by our friend, which are all indicated when we say, that few men can ever have been better fitted to counsel, guide, sustain, and reinforce the minds of others. Not alone to professional clients was he thus serviceable, but to friends and neighbors and his own family, in the various emergencies that make one anxious to get light which he cannot find for himself, and long for a support in sympathy which his own strength has failed to give. Mr. Atherton was resorted to, and leaned upon, by many who had learned



how dispassionate and cool, judicious and candid, gentle and sympathetic, he was. He won, and kept through life, a perfect confidence in the hearts of those who knew him well. So delicate was his sense of honor, so pure his conscientiousness, so constant his fidelity, so void of guile was he, as that none doubted that what he had under his control would be safe, and whatever he undertook to do would be done. He had no caprices, no eccentricities, no extravagance. His reason, affections, and conscience seemed to act always in harmony for a common end. Hence his character was uniform and consistent. One always knew where to find him. Here, too, was his good influence continuous and unintermittent. Society could count him among her pillars. His opinions were deliberately formed, but were not easily disturbed when once settled in his mind. He was not hasty in his attachments, but they were never hastily abandoned. Energetic and decisive, he was of great modesty, without arrogance or self-sufficiency. He was dignified and self-possessed, not to be overcome by his own or others' emotions; yet tender and affectionate; and if of wonderful fortitude, of as remarkable a submissiveness, and feeling of his absolute dependence on God for strength and aid. He was regarded with a degree of reverence where he drew most affection to himself. His own manner was that which shows respect to others in such a way as implies an equally habitual and secure reliance on their respect in return.

If not what is called a learned man, Mr. Atherton was abundantly furnished with all necessary knowledge, and was well informed in the literature and science of his times. He read much, and not uncritically. A member of the Historical Society, he contributed to its papers. He wrote, also, occasionally, political articles for the daily press.

It is impossible to think of Mr. Atherton without including his habitual piety. There was some reference to religion in whatever he did. A religious spirit sanctified his domestic happiness, and was diffused over his social intercourse. Piety gave to his mind its habitual tone. It sustained and comforted him in sorrows which admitted no other solace, and made serene and hopeful his declining years.

In religious opinions Mr. Atherton was a Unitarian. He was early made a Vice-President of the American Unitarian Association, and very liberally contributed to its funds, and for the interests of the denomination generally. He made great sacrifices for the sake of the truth in his native town, and was its unfaltering advocate till death.

Mr. Atherton was married in early manhood to Miss Marianne Toppan, daughter of the Hon. Christopher Toppan of Hampton Falls. She was a remarkably intelligent woman, whose tastes and principles were congenial with those of her husband. He survived her thirty-five years, but did not again marry. He always spoke of the companion of his early life with unabated tenderness. Two only of their children remained in life when he left the world. And of these, the daughter, endeared to her father by great devotion to his happiness for many years, his nurse, solace, and pride, has since gone to join him in his better home.